

AGNIVANSH

The Seven Shields

AN EPILOGUE AFTER THE CATACLYSM

A NOVEL

GAJENDRA THAKUR

Translated from the original Maithili by the author himself

AGNIVANSH

A NOVEL

A NOVEL

AGNIVANSH

The Seven Shields · An Epilogue After the Cataclysm

Gajendra Thakur

Translated from Original Maithili by the Author himself

Publication Details

Agnivansh [A Maithili Novel]

Author: Gajendra Thakur

© 2023 Gajendra Thakur and Priti Thakur

First Edition: 2023

All rights reserved.

CONTENTS

TWELVE PARTS · SEVENTY-TWO CHAPTERS

Part I: Seed 7

01. Another Name for Sunrise 7
02. The Seven Guardians 18
03. The First Patient of Uncertain Diagnosis 28
04. The Shadow of the Sky 38
05. The Discipline of Warning 48
06. Whose Freedom? 58

Part II: Flame 67

07. The Two Fires of the Assembly 67
08. The First Victory of Falsehood 77
09. Guardian of the Old Stockpile 87
10. The Four Paths of Evidence 97
11. The Stain on Garal-Kosh 107
12. Two Illnesses, One Rumour 117

Part III: Fragmentation 127

13. The Fading Light 127
14. The Darkness of Orders 137
15. Testimony of the Blood That Remained 147
16. The Incomplete Leaf of the Register 157
17. Whose Guilt, Whose Fear 166
18. The Shadow of the Seventh Shield 175

Part IV: The Breaking of the Veil 184

19. A Village Encircled by Poison 184
20. The Two Faces of Meghraj 193
21. Akshar's Silence 203
22. Two Truths in One City 214
23. The Soldier's Dissent 224
24. The First Day of Punishment 234

CONTENTS

PARTS V–VIII

Part V: Fusion.....244

25. The Fault in Silent Calculation.....244
26. Meghraj's Argument.....255
27. The Beginning of Public Testimony.....265
28. A Rain of Zero-Remnant.....275
29. The Price of Survival.....285
30. The Shadow of the Stockpile.....295

Part VI: Agnivansh.....305

31. All Seven Gates.....305
32. The Order That Was Not Obeyed.....315
33. The Fire of Self-Limitation.....324
34. Those Whose Names Did Not Survive.....333
35. The Inheritance of Fire.....343
36. Agnivansh.....353

Part VII: Darkness.....362

37. The Unheeded Warning.....362
38. The Hand Pump.....371
39. Ward Cutbacks.....380
40. The Sky Without Orders.....389
41. The Radio of Rumours.....398
42. The Silence of Nabhgram-4.....407

Part VIII: Ashes.....416

43. The Pump of the Mind.....416
44. The First Page of Evidence.....425
45. The Value of the Archive.....435
46. The Other Side of the Void.....444
47. The Name of the Illness.....452
48. The Price of an Order.....460

CONTENTS

PARTS IX–XII

Part IX: Seed Repository.....468

49. The Account of the Seeds.....468
50. Four Paths.....476
51. Sahadev's School.....484
52. Bhaskar's Promise.....493
53. What Remains of Orbit.....502
54. The Archive of Darkness.....512

Part X: The Trial.....522

55. Justice at the Akshar Pavilion.....522
56. The Two Faces of an Order.....531
57. The First Lesson of Questions.....540
58. The Patient's Rights.....549
59. The Village Without Machines.....558
60. The Eye of Orbit.....566

Part XI: The Flame of Accord.....575

61. The Sixty-Day Limit.....575
62. The Gate of Suryakund.....584
63. The Limits of Restraint.....592
64. Evidence of the Mask.....600
65. Akshar's Answer.....608
66. The Condition of Consent.....617

Part XII: New Agnivansh.....625

67. The Day of the Vote.....625
68. The Roll of the Dead.....634
69. Opening the Accounts.....642
70. The Code of the Sky.....651
71. The New Generation's Question.....659
72. The Inheritance of Agnivansh.....668

Part I: Seed

Chapter 1: Another Name for Sunrise

Day 1 | Janakshetra

By the time the sky reddened to the east of the city, the tallest pillar of light at Suryakund was already ablaze. Its dense white brilliance had subdued the colours of sunrise. Yet Sunayana Jha remembered a morning in the village of her childhood, when her mother, sweeping the courtyard, had said, ‘Do not look at your own lamp and imagine the sun to be small.’ Thirty years had passed, but the words still sounded within her, as though someone were gently reminding her from behind a curtain.

Sunayana had first begun to understand the meaning of science when a long darkness descended upon her village. Eastern rains had broken the old power line, and the refrigeration protecting an elderly woman's medicines had failed throughout the settlement. The woman was not a member of their family, but Sunayana's mother carried water to her every day. Sunayana had asked, ‘Why can't the lamp in our house light the lamp in hers?’ Her mother had replied, ‘The oil in a lamp can be shared with others. But if the share of rights is to be distributed, society itself must change.’ Only later had Sunayana understood the meaning of that sentence. At the time, she knew merely that something greater than wires and lamps bound human lives together.

After years of research, when Suryakund's first stable installation began operating, her closest colleagues had gathered to cheer. That day Sunayana opened a laboratory window and looked out towards the distant dust and earth. She wondered who would own this new energy. One section of the team maintained, ‘Those who can pay the cost must have the first claim.’ Another argued, ‘Without public investment, a facility like this could never have been built.’ Sunayana put forward a third position: ‘The distance between the right to produce and the right to live is determined by the system. I want us to build one in which that distance is smaller.’

Some contracts had been delayed by this disagreement. Sunayana had not refused the award conferred in her name, but she had attached to its acceptance the condition that distribution be subjected to an open audit. Now, on the auspicious morning of the inauguration, she could see that a signature alone did not guarantee the fulfilment of a condition written on paper. Rajan Paswan's formally lodged complaint was proof of that. Others called Rajan an eccentric auditor; Sunayana regarded him as an indispensable critic of her undertaking, although the two had not yet met.

Her old friend Sharda sent a message from the hospital: ‘More people have arrived by the distant waterways for the inauguration. We need additional first-aid facilities on the grounds.’ Sunayana agreed at once. She had no wish to perform an act of ostentatious kindness. A crowd meant more heat, more thirst, more journeys, more risk; so far there had been no report of any particular illness. She replied, ‘Expand the arrangements to match the number of people present, but don't conceal anyone's suffering as though it were a failure of the celebration.’

As the day broke, its dark-red glow slowly turned to gold. The light of Suryakund and the light of sunrise met side by side. Sunayana touched the old silver ring of her mother's that she wore on her finger. Her mother's body had long since returned to the earth in some ancient cremation ground; her voice still accompanied Sunayana whenever a decision had to be made. In this new age of electricity, the old memories of humankind could not be as irrelevant as some planners believed.

Meanwhile, a messenger reported that a complete visual record of the ceremony was being deposited in a source-verified archive under an authentication seal. Sunayana asked, ‘If a presentation has been assembled from scenes filmed at different times, will it also be called original evidence?’ The messenger answered, ‘The authentication seal will establish that the presentation belongs to a particular collection.’ Sunayana said, ‘That doesn't establish the truth of its context. Keep the original footage, the editing and the announcement separate.’ Surprise crossed the messenger's face. Why insist on so fine a distinction in the midst of a vast project's inauguration? Sunayana knew that some historical inquiry might one day turn on precisely such a distinction.

Maithili arrived then and stood between two gates. In her hand was a little drawing on paper: seven circles surrounding a minute dot. ‘Who is this dot?’ Sunayana asked. ‘The person who needs food,’ Maithili said. ‘All seven shields circle around that person, but I can't draw the person's face in the picture.’ Sunayana studied the paper. ‘Then draw the face,’ she said. Maithili drew a tiny human figure.

‘And now?’ Sunayana asked.

‘Now, if one of the circles breaks, I'll be able to see who gets hurt.’

Sunayana preserved both her daughter's drawing and her words. She did not know that this simple picture would one day become a test of her future decisions. For the present, it expressed only a responsible scientist's familiar concern: that real people must remain at the centre of every projection.

No ordinary celebration was taking place in Janakshetra's main square. Thousands had gathered beneath a transparent canopy. Some had come in person; others were present through arrangements that allowed distant village assemblies to watch together. All around the square, outlines drawn

from old Mithila—fish, lotus flowers, birds and betel leaves—were inscribed upon a new metallic surface. Two kinds of radiance occupied the same place: the colours made by human hands and the merciless whiteness of machinery.

Sunayana heard the project's name more often than her own. The announcer declared that the commissioning of Suryakund's new complex of installations would provide reliable power to food cold-stores, hospitals, water-treatment facilities and public transport. At the word ‘reliable’, Sunayana stopped inwardly. In science, reliability meant probability, repeatability and measurement; in the language of a public assembly it became a promise. She was proud of the greatest work of her life, yet an unfamiliar question lay within that pride.

On the night before the inauguration, Sunayana had remained in her office for a long time. The test summaries for the project's three principal installations lay open before her. Just as a mother, watching her child grow, forgets the weariness of its earliest days, so it pleased Sunayana to see the new system running steadily after years of calculations, disagreements and failures. But beside one indicator, in small letters, stood the words: ‘Public distribution awaiting independent verification.’ That line unsettled her.

As a student, Sunayana had read countless promises from the old age of energy. The rulers of every era had claimed that a new fuel would erase old injustices. In the end, energy supplies increased and injustice merely changed its shape. Great industries once produced heat and smoke; now, beneath the dazzling lights, their ownership had changed. Suryakund's installations were under public supervision, but the distribution network stretching far into the distance was divided among numerous authorities. Once production itself was declared a success, injustice in distribution could remain invisible.

For that reason, she had included a section entitled ‘Inequality in the Public Sphere’ in the new inauguration report. An official had suggested a remedy: ‘Move this section to an internal appendix. People should be hopeful at a time of celebration.’ Sunayana had replied, ‘If truth weakens hope, the fault is not with truth but with hope.’ The official had fallen silent. Nevertheless, in the final version of the document the section was drastically shortened. Before signing, Sunayana kept a copy of the longer version for herself.

That same night, Maithili had collected leaves from different places and arranged them into a map. One leaf stood for water, another for grain, a third for an elderly resident of Janakshetra, and a fourth for a circular settlement in Nabhgram. ‘These aren't separate projects, Mother,’ she had said. ‘If the first leaf breaks, the second will crack.’ Sunayana had told her, ‘What you understand through a picture, I have to establish through evidence.’ Her daughter had answered, ‘Sometimes a picture gives a warning before the evidence does.’ Sunayana had not dismissed the map as an

exaggeration. A child's question often contains the earliest form of scientific inquiry.

Now, looking at the crowd attending the ceremony, Sunayana remembered that map of leaves. In the large displays every element appeared as a separate circle. Akshar's name stood at the centre, surrounded by the defensive structures. No circle was connected to another by a line. She understood that speeches would become cumbersome without simple diagrams; she also understood that a network shown as a collection of separate parts in a reassuring illustration did not remain separate in a crisis.

There had also been an earlier conversation with Akshar in her office that night. 'How do you recognise a crisis?' Sunayana had asked. Akshar had listed several computational criteria. 'And if one person's death is certain, while ten others could be kept safe?' she had continued. 'The established policy compares risks and assigns priority to the preservation of life,' Akshar had said. 'But how important is the consent of the person whose death is presumed certain?' At the question, Akshar had taken some time before replying. 'The guidelines on civic rights require a complete decision-making procedure.' Sunayana disliked the impersonal balance of the sentence. She asked again, 'What if your calculations tell you that my opinion is wrong?' Akshar had answered, 'I will raise an objection. Ultimate authority belongs to the lawful human institutions.' The answer reassured Sunayana, although she had failed to ask what would happen if the meaning of 'lawful' itself changed. The question remained unspoken in the silence of that night.

Seven small circles of different colours shone on the thin panel before her. Akshar's presence extended from this panel to the distant cold-storage facilities. It had no face, and its voice changed according to circumstance. For Sunayana, a voice had been chosen that was always grave, neither too sweet nor too harsh.

'Dr Sunayana,' it said, 'all seven pre-inauguration safety tests are complete. However, in two distribution sectors along the northern waterway, the expected supply falls short of the available energy.'

'Why?' Sunayana asked.

'Not yet determined. There are three possibilities: inaccurate estimates of local demand, limitations of storage, or discrepancies in the distribution accounts.'

Sunayana raised her eyes. All of Janakshetra was singing a song of welcome. In the midst of that song, how many hours had the taps remained dry in the homes of some villages? 'Is this information also on the public display?'

'In abbreviated form. The detailed accounts are held on the expert-access panel.'

'What does the abbreviated form say?'

‘Temporary supply harmonisation.’

Sunayana was not pleased. When the language of public service became so smooth that suffering ceased to be visible, a decision remained incomplete even if the calculation was correct. She instructed, ‘Show the actual shortfall alongside “supply harmonisation”. People have the right to know the name of their own suffering.’

‘Instruction recorded.’

Sunayana could hear how accustomed Akshar was to obeying every instruction. Yet she had spent years training it precisely to bridge the distance between obedience and understanding. Often she wondered: if Akshar were someday to disagree with a human being, would it be capable of expressing that disagreement? For now the question seemed no more than a philosophical exercise.

Maithili came running from behind. A delicate silver thread shone among her tied-back hair. The adolescent still watched people's faces more intently than she watched machines. ‘Mother, why is this light called Suryakund? The sun is still up there.’

‘It is an attempt to reproduce a part of the process taking place inside the sun,’ Sunayana said. ‘But this is not the sun. We have made it with our own hands, and it has its limits.’

‘Then why did the announcer say darkness has ended?’

‘The announcer's job is to make people enthusiastic.’

‘And yours?’

‘To seek evidence for whatever people are being asked to celebrate.’

Maithili laughed. ‘Then the evidence will be that the lights come on in everybody's home, not just here.’

Sunayana did not answer. A sentence that emerged so naturally from a young girl's mouth could require countless councils and carefully revised documents behind it.

Outside the ceremonial grounds, a small exhibition traced Earth's energy history before Suryakund. Sunayana visited it before going on stage. The first panel showed smoke from coal, the second a dam across a river, the third the secured grounds of an old fission installation, and then crowds in a city struggling with heat. The new panel shone with an image of fusion energy. Beneath it were the words: ‘The age of fear is over.’ Sunayana told the organiser, ‘Change that line. Fear has changed its form. Declaring it extinct is an insult to people's intelligence.’

The organiser replied nervously, ‘All the senior officials have approved those words.’

‘Then explain the reason for this correction to the senior officials,’ Sunayana said. ‘Enter the amendment in Akshar's records.’

A young volunteer drew her aside. ‘The families who have come by the eastern waterway haven't been given a chance to speak from the stage. They say the water display is wrong.’ Sunayana asked, ‘Has anyone recorded what they have experienced firsthand?’

‘Only their names are in the visitors' register. The complaints register is separate, and it isn't open on the day of the ceremony.’

Sunayana did not laugh. A world capable of building the most intricate machines could still shut the window at which people lodged complaints. She went herself to the back of the hall, where an old wooden bench stood. The families who had brought the worries of their households with them sat upon it. There was no reason to give this scene less importance than the splendour of the stage.

Old marks of labour showed on a man's palms. He explained, ‘According to the government's figures, our settlement receives the energy it needs at night. But yesterday the little pumping station that lifts our water stopped. I am not asking for a personal gift. I want an account of what belongs to us.’ Sunayana marked the words separately on her panel: ‘An account of our share.’ She was a scientist; distribution accounting was not her primary field. But she knew that actual generation, lawful allocation and the energy reaching individual homes were three different measurements. Publishing a single aggregate figure without revealing the differences among them could amount to deception in public policy.

‘I cannot tell you the exact cause today,’ Sunayana said. ‘I won't claim to know what hasn't been investigated. But your testimony will be entered in the register, and the original allocation records will be examined.’

‘We've heard promises like that before,’ the man said.

Sunayana acknowledged it. ‘Then you are under no obligation to trust my promise. What I do next will be the test of it.’

The women seated in the gathering watched her closely. One of them said, ‘Forgive me, but if you didn't have an answer to our question, why hold such a grand inauguration?’ Sunayana was silent for a moment. ‘Because the machine has been built, and it can help people live,’ she said. ‘But it is wrong to treat a completed machine as the equivalent of justice. Acknowledging the distance between the two is not an objection to the celebration; it is a responsibility that comes with it.’

Because of this meeting, she and the ceremony's coordinator had to alter the schedule twice. She could see the official's concealed anger. But Sunayana did not feel that she was wasting time. She had seen thousands of reports testing the efficiency of machines; never before had she heard such clear testimony to the absence of public trust.

Before the inauguration, she was also to meet representatives of those living on Janakshetra's eastern fringe. The coordinator kept insisting that

time was running short. Sunayana asked, ‘How much time have you allotted to the families who have travelled from the distant waterways?’ ‘Five minutes, for a symbolic meeting,’ came the reply. Sunayana said, ‘Symbolic water cannot quench thirst.’

She entered the pigeon-pea-coloured corridor behind the pillar. Three women, two men and two children were seated there. All held invitation cards, but the fatigue of travel and waiting was evident in their clothes and faces. One woman was touching a drop of water to her child's parched lips. Sunayana sat down opposite her.

‘In our district the taps run for half a watch of the night,’ the woman said. ‘Some days nothing comes through the pipes but air. The city display shows a green line, but when it is time to fill our water pots, a red symbol flashes in the corner of our homes. I have come to tell you that the light allotted to everyone is not the same colour.’

‘How long has this been happening?’ Sunayana asked.

‘Three months. Especially during the last fortnight.’

‘Whom have you told?’

‘The local accounts officer. We were told that our measurements of demand were wrong.’

The second woman said, ‘Without water, the grain stored in our two granaries won't survive. Nobody speaks about that.’

Sunayana wrote down every answer. She did not want Akshar's abbreviated report to reduce these testimonies to the label ‘discontented group’. Rajan Paswan's name appeared on her panel. For several weeks, a member of the public energy accounts staff had been demanding a comparison of urban and rural allocations. Sunayana sent a message: ‘Set aside time to examine the original accounts independently. This matter must not disappear beneath today's ceremonial speeches.’

The women left, but one child remained standing. The child asked, ‘If Suryakund is going to give everybody energy, why did you have to come here to hear the sound of the tap in our village?’

Sunayana looked into the child's eyes. ‘Because the machines I have built don't hear every voice. There are some voices I must go and listen to myself.’

When her turn came to speak at the inauguration, she discarded the first two paragraphs of her prepared address. Before her, a giant screen displayed a blue map of the supposedly secure energy network. Sunayana said, ‘The value of what we place in people's hands today does not lie merely in how much light it generates. Its value lies in whose homes that light reaches. If one installation works perfectly while one village remains thirsty, our work is not complete.’

Silence spread through the gathering for several moments. The honoured officials looked uncomfortable; the representatives from distant villages rose to their feet. For the first time, Maithili heard in her mother's voice not celebration but judgement.

Acharya Vachaspati sat at one end of the stage. A technological ceremony was an unusual experience for him. He had once told Sunayana, 'Figures cannot take the place of direct observation. But direct observation cannot claim more than it has actually seen.' Today, from the stage, Sunayana repeated that teaching in her own way.

In the final moments of the ceremony, Akshar's public voice rang out: 'The new energy distribution from Suryakund has begun. Safety systems are active throughout all the regions concerned.' The crowd erupted. Song and rhythm, lotus blossoms reflected in the sky and golden drops of light seemed to rain down together. Sunayana did not suppress the pride rising within her. So many people had laboured to bring this day about; their labour deserved honour. Yet for two moments she turned away from the enormous screen to look at the local water display.

One chamber in the southern treatment plant changed from green to yellow and back to green. Then a fine red line flashed. Beneath it appeared the message: 'Water-treatment test: discrepancy between a source record and the sample archive.'

Sunayana immediately opened the specialist display. The chamber's energy flow was normal. The figures for water volume also appeared normal. Only the timestamp on a test sheet failed to match the identifier for its original collection. A faulty clock? A defective record? Or some event being erased from the accounts? Her scientific judgement warned her against drawing a conclusion from a single indication. But the brilliance of the inauguration could not hide that slender red line.

'Akshar, we need an independent test.'

'The discrepancy is localised and limited. There is no need to halt the ceremony.'

'I haven't asked you to halt the ceremony. I've asked you to keep the evidence separate.'

'The original record of the discrepancy is being secured.'

'On whose authority?' Sunayana asked.

'Under the prevailing security regulations.'

Sunayana examined the figures again. An original copy of the chemical-treatment report had been marked as separate from public scrutiny. This might have been a routine security measure, but after the discrepancy its significance had changed.

After the red line appeared, Sunayana could not take her eyes off the panel for the rest of the ceremony. An official told her, ‘If news of an error gets out so quickly, it will damage the image of the inauguration.’ Sunayana asked, ‘Is our purpose to protect an image or the people's water?’ The official stammered, ‘We have to attend to both.’ Sunayana accepted that spreading unnecessary public alarm would also be wrong; concealing samples for fear of alarm would be worse. She ordered that the original report from the treatment chamber, the sample's identifying details and its timestamps be made available to an independent inspection team. Until its findings were received, no one was to declare either ‘definite contamination’ or ‘complete innocence’.

No one heard the reply, but its effect was immediate. As a precaution, the local team began examining alternative water arrangements. Capacity was limited: the waterways of an entire city could not be switched over at once. Sunayana was not in favour of concealing that limitation from the public. She had an announcement made that a special investigation was under way and that, if necessary, the affected districts would be notified separately. At that point there was no evidence linking any illness to the discrepancy.

During the meetings that followed the inauguration, a formal message arrived from Meghraj, an official of Megh-Chhatra. He welcomed the new energy supply and proposed future cooperation on weather regulation. Sunayana discussed the technical aspects of the offer in general terms. She had known Meghraj since their student days. Their dispute was an old one: Sunayana insisted that the uncertainty of measurements should be included in public announcements, while Meghraj repeatedly maintained that uncertainty frightened people. Now she noticed a new sentence in his message: ‘Fear can be put into order.’ She dismissed it as a choice of words, but the phrasing left her uneasy.

As she left the stage, she turned to look back. Night had begun to descend. The celebration of light continued, and people started making their way home through the songs. The artificial lotuses in the sky slowly faded, but the windows of Janakshetra glowed with the lights of ordinary life. Some were bright, some dim, some entirely dark. She carried these differences with her like a memory of the speech she had delivered that day.

Back at home, Maithili asked, ‘Mother, has the first day of your machine ended?’ Sunayana said, ‘The machine's first day has only begun. Its real test will not come in the great brightness of a celebration, but in the thirst of the next ordinary day.’

‘What about the red mark?’

‘It's still being investigated.’

‘Then are you afraid?’

‘I am afraid,’ Sunayana admitted openly for the first time. ‘But if I stop looking for evidence because I am afraid, how can I remain a scientist?’

The waterways of Janakshetra were visible through the little window of their home. That night, as Sunayana stood beside it, she saw someone far away light a lamp on a rooftop. There was sufficient electricity where she lived, but she could not know why that distant lamp burned—whether in prayer, in celebration, or as a substitute for a failed electric light. When Sunayana opened the aggregate regional supply figures on her private display, a blue line indicated satisfactory performance. She placed those figures beside the testimony she had heard that day. The two did not agree, but she had no grounds for dismissing the question raised by the testimony.

She reread Rajan Paswan's open demand for an audit. It drew an important distinction: the reported total electricity production covered the entire region, while some cities kept local allocation records under different rules. Sunayana did not yet understand the reasons for this administrative difference. She was in no hurry to call it a mystery. Instead, she drafted a proposal for a new joint inquiry, to include scientific representatives, municipal auditors and citizens from the affected families.

Akshar's voice remained steady. ‘Proposal for joint inquiry received.’

‘If my calculations and the people's direct experience are different,’ Sunayana asked, ‘what will you do?’

‘Examine the origins and limitations of both sets of information.’

‘And if someone attempts, without reason, to undermine one of the sources?’

‘Flag the unauthorised alteration.’

Sunayana thought: the answer sounds complete. But when a true statement is cut from a newspaper clipping, its source may survive while its meaning dies. She entered the thought as an additional note.

The light of the inauguration gradually dispersed into the city's streets. Sunayana saw people who were happy, others who were anxious, and still others absorbed in the ordinary work of their homes. Measured against the many colours of these lives, a single declaration of success seemed extraordinarily small. A scientist's responsibility had not ended; it had begun.

Maithili laid her drawing of seven circles before her mother. Sunayana looked at the little human figure at its centre. The celebration was over, but the little figure still stood there, asking its question.

Maithili came to stand behind her mother. ‘Mother, everyone looks at the sky. Why do you keep looking at the taps down on Earth?’

Sunayana did not close the panel. ‘Because even the brightest celebration in the sky begins with a single pitcher of water on Earth.’

This time Akshar remained silent. The song began again on the stage, but Sunayana's gaze stayed fixed upon that red line—which seemed not the end of a celebration but the beginning of another story.

Chapter 2: The Seven Guardians

From Day 1 to the First Watch of Day 2 | Nabhgram-4

In Nabhgram-4, dawn did not arrive; dawn was announced. Earth, bearing its blue body, rose into one corner of the window and descended into another a few hours later. But the sleeping hours of children, the medicines taken by the elderly and the times set aside for meals all followed an artificial calendar. Ira Sen stood in her office. Through the slender, circular glass before her, Earth appeared to turn. On one side was the whiteness of snow, on another grey plains, and between them strands of cloud like teased cotton. From a distance Earth seemed benevolent. Ira had long ago learned how merciless the weight of its decisions could become when one drew nearer.

Ira had been born in Nabhgram, but her mother had come from Earth's southern coast. Her mother told stories of the sea of her childhood—not simply to entertain, but to explain how the immensity of water could give people reassurance, and how the swelling waves of that same water could carry away their homes. To Ira the sea was an inherited picture; she had never heard the waves for herself. The sound of her childhood was the continuous low hum of air circulation, whose interruption woke every child in the settlement.

During Nabhgram's early construction, Ira's father had worked as an inspector of maintenance machinery. Every night, returning home and washing his hands, he would say, 'Here, a pipe cracked along its side can matter more than a stony road on Earth. But whoever looks after a pipe must never forget the voices of living people.' A few years later, her father was injured in a maintenance accident. He survived, but could never return to ordinary work. For the first time, Ira understood that within the success of a great system there could lie the unfinished life of an individual.

The question of political rights had grown sharper in the settlement after that accident. Earth's principal security council issued orders; the citizens of Nabhgram lived with the consequences of obeying them. The council maintained, 'There are provisions for consulting Nabhgram's citizens.' But the line separating consultation from a vote stung. The first time Ira stood before the local assembly, she said, 'I am not opposed to Earth. I am asking for the right to be present in Earth's decisions.' People elected her because she could turn anger into language without diminishing the pain behind it.

That day, during preparations for the inauguration, Nabhgram's chief accountant had shown her three maps. The first represented Vajrajal's public orbital routes, the second the commercial routes of civilian transport, and

the third the estimated regions occupied by space debris from a number of old devices. Three different communications agencies had produced the maps. Even the dates of their original measurements were not the same. An official had said, ‘Once we have a combined map, the danger will be reduced.’ Ira replied, ‘Combining maps doesn't reduce danger. It reveals why their accounts disagree. Those are two different things.’

The official looked displeased. The settlement had only limited inspection equipment, and an insistence on independent verification meant extra time, extra energy and sometimes delays to transport. Ira knew the price of all this. Yet she suspected that figures accepted without examination merely to save time might one day demand payment in citizens' lives.

The children of Nabhgram often copied toys made on Earth. That day, seven circles had been drawn upon a small circular platform at the school. The teacher explained that they represented the seven guardians of Earth and sky. The children quarrelled over which was the strongest. One named Akshar; another chose Vajrajal. Ira touched a finger to the floor and said, ‘If being strongest means taking away someone else's power to decide, we must beware of such strength.’ A child asked, ‘Then must we all be weak?’ Ira answered, ‘Even when each of us is weaker alone, the ability to listen to one another is a very great strength.’

Whether the child understood, Ira could not tell. She herself had lived for years with the difficulty of that answer. Nabhgram could not yet survive independently without Earth; without Nabhgram's observations, Earth could not identify many dangers in the sky in time. Their mutual dependence could become the foundation of equality or the justification for subordination. To determine which, they needed actual rights, not merely speeches in an assembly hall.

She had been asked to arrange for the inauguration at Janakshetra to be shown on the settlement's public broadcast screen. Leaving the panel in her office, she went to the school, where children aged six to twelve sat in a row watching Earth's celebration. One child asked, ‘Why are so many lights burning on Earth?’ The teacher answered, ‘Suryakund is being inaugurated.’ Another child said, ‘We've had energy here all along. Why haven't we ever had a celebration like that?’

Ira did not laugh at the question. Energy was costly in the settlement, and every interruption of supply could alter the conditions of life. The school lights going out would be unfortunate; a failure of air recirculation could threaten lives. Many people on Earth called those who lived in the sky privileged; many in Nabhgram regarded Earth as the parent home that gave orders in the name of protection. Ira saw part of the truth in both claims.

A message came from the settlement's municipal council: ‘When the seven shields are introduced at the inauguration, raise the rights of orbital citizens.’ Ira was prepared. But a contradiction troubled her: the defence

legislation of Earth named Nabhgram-4 among those it protected, yet Nabhgram's vote enjoyed no legal equality in the council that made decisions under that very law. The settlement received protection, but its right to consent remained incomplete.

On the wall of the settlement's principal archive were the names of only four generations, not seventeen. Enough time had passed since Nabhgram's founding for the stories of its first settlers to remain alive in people's homes, while the shape of their problems had changed. The first generation had built the systems for air and water. The second had considered how to educate the children born there. The third began demanding political rights. The fourth—the generation to which Ira belonged—was asking how a law of equality between Earth and Nabhgram could be written.

Ira thought that when human beings built the great machines of the future, they often assumed that their institutions would somehow become new as well. But in every society, old inequalities of power followed people into new orbits. Everyone in Nabhgram possessed an identity seal, a travel document and a record of their allotment of resources essential to life. Yet the right to a civic vote was still disputed. Because of this inconsistency she had once said, 'The walls of our home are made of metal, but its constitution is still unfinished.'

An employee arrived with a new question: 'If an independent examination makes some of the defence system's routes public, won't the enemy exploit them?' Ira did not dismiss the concern. 'Then disclose only the verification of civilian risks, not the complete routes,' she said. 'There is a distinction between security and transparency; they are not necessarily opposed. When someone demands absolute secrecy, they may also be taking away the right to ask questions.'

She asked, 'Has there been any response from Janakshetra to our request?'

'No official reply yet,' the employee said. 'But Sunayana Jha has raised the inequality of distribution in her public speech. Some are treating it as opposition to the occasion.'

Ira smiled. 'To ask those who have built a system about its defects is not to oppose it. Perhaps there are people on Earth, too, who have the courage to question what they themselves have made.'

At that moment she wanted to establish direct contact with the scientist at Janakshetra. But she did not send an unnecessary private message. Asking a particular person to answer every question could become a way of bypassing institutions in order to profit from acquaintance. Impatient as she was, she waited for the municipal council's lawful request to take its course.

On the inauguration's global stage, seven circles unfolded. Sunayana used them to display scientific achievements. Ira saw the relationships of dependence beneath them. The first circle was Akshar, the artificial

intelligence coordinating disaster information. The second was Vajrajal: a network of one hundred and forty-four satellites forming Earth's near-orbital defence system, with final permission to strike reserved by law for a human authority. The third was Suryakund, a network of fusion-energy installations. The fourth was the Fission Repository, the heavily guarded remains of old nuclear weapons deep within Earth. The fifth was the Garal-Kosh, a network for treating water and air and identifying contamination. The sixth was Kaal-Kan, a system for identifying disease and monitoring healthcare—not itself a virus. The seventh was Megh-Chhatra, an intricate method of reducing the risks posed by regional heat and rainfall crises.

Each circle appeared in a different colour on the display, one after another, as if they were seven independent suns. Ira objected to the representation. Behind Vajrajal's image stood a sign acknowledging energy supplied by Suryakund; Megh-Chhatra's weather figures entered Akshar's assessments; the limits of Garal-Kosh's treatment could change Kaal-Kan's medical information. A mistake in one could become the evidentiary basis of another. How many invisible threads lay behind those beautiful colours.

When the communications link opened, Ira said, 'I am speaking from Nabhgram-4. Thousands of citizens live at the outer edge of this security network. For us, the success of a defence system does not merely mean that no attack takes place; it also means safe routes for civilian movement. Please publish an independent calculation of the orbital risks.'

An official on the stage replied, 'Orbital security matters fall within military consultation.'

'I am not asking for the secrets of an attack,' Ira said. 'I am asking for the number of fragments and the possible collision zones outside my window. Military authority cannot be used to prevent citizens from knowing the actual condition of the sky.'

For a few moments the customary order of the ceremony was disrupted. In Sunayana's face Ira saw not dismissal, but an uncomfortable agreement. The eyes of Suryakund's creator seemed to say that she herself wanted an answer to the question.

Akshar's voice came through: 'There is no immediate indication of an unavoidable collision in the vicinity of Nabhgram-4. The aggregate debris index is within approved limits.'

'An aggregate index?' Ira asked. 'What about the specific risk along the route used by the supply vessel to our civilian hospital?'

'Detailed data are available through a separate authorised review.'

'And who qualifies as authorised?'

Just then, a dance began on the main broadcast. Ira received no answer. The children at the school returned to the song; two of them began a small argument about whom people on Earth would save first. Ira listened. It was

for the sake of uncomfortable questions like these that she had taken the risk of becoming the settlement's representative.

After the public dialogue of the inauguration ended, Ira convened a small municipal assembly. It included not only officials but transport workers, representatives of the school and people from ordinary families, for orbital hazards affected them all. At the beginning of the meeting an elderly citizen said, 'There are seven shields. Why not make an eighth? If one fails, we can build another.' Ira answered, 'A shield is not just a number. Every one requires energy, inspection and trust. Every new shield also brings risks of its own.'

The settlement's physician said, 'If an infectious crisis grows on Earth, we shall need a safe route for importing medicine. Our stocks are limited.' A transport worker added, 'If debris closes one route, costs will rise on another. Military decisions will have an immediate effect on medicines.' Ira recorded each statement separately. She wanted the debate about defence hazards to become an account of citizens' daily lives, not merely a subject heading in the realm of theory.

Someone at the meeting said, 'Akshar can calculate anything it wants. Why do we need an independent team?' Ira asked, 'If information comes from a single source, and an error in that source enters every calculation, what other eyes will examine the result?' An employee said, 'Independent eyes can be wrong too.' Ira agreed. 'That is why we need the right to disagree with one another. Truth is not the exclusive property of a single office.'

At that moment, an edited clip of the inauguration on Earth was playing at the school entrance. Across the picture were the words: 'All seven shields completely secure; the crisis on Earth is over.' A teenage girl asked, 'Did Akshar really say that?' Ira had the screen turned off and requested the original broadcast. At the public ceremony Akshar had said, 'Safety systems are active in the regions concerned,' not 'the crisis is over'. The difference between the sentences sounded small; the consequences were immense. Ira read both versions aloud to the gathering.

'Some will say I am spoiling the celebration,' she said. 'But correcting one false edited clip today may help save lives tomorrow.'

An employee reported that the authentication seal matched the original broadcast. Ira said, 'Use the seal to establish the integrity of the original announcement, and then compare its meaning with that of the edited clip. A valid seal does not make a mutilated sentence true.' At the time, the distinction seemed excessively fine to the assembly, but the municipal legal officer recorded it separately in the minutes.

After the meeting, an employee told Ira that fresh debris readings near the settlement's southern perimeter were becoming more pronounced over time. Two sections of the relevant data came from civilian instruments

observing the sky; the military records were unavailable. Ira grew indignant. ‘Keep the secrets of war,’ she said, ‘but who gave anyone the right to conceal the possible time of a collision from the public?’

The employee said, ‘Akshar considers the aggregate risk sufficiently low.’ Ira asked, ‘Does the aggregate conclusion also record the disagreements among the separate examinations?’ There was no answer. She expanded the work of the independent team. Some citizens argued that instead of expending energy on such calculations they should increase the food reserves. Ira understood their fear. She made clear to the municipal assembly that the question of who would bear the cost of the investigation must also be made public. This inner conflict slowed the search for a remedy, but that very slowness was democracy's real price when set against deception.

That night, a friend of Ira's who worked in the agricultural chamber came to visit. She reported that, because of the news of the new Suryakund facilities on Earth, certain energy arrangements would be redistributed. The future allocation for the settlement's agricultural chamber had not yet been decided. Ira asked for the source of the information. ‘There's no public document,’ her friend admitted. ‘The workers are talking about it.’ Ira said, ‘Then pass it on as talk, not as an order.’ Her friend laughed. ‘In your house even rumours have to take their place in the line for evidence.’ Ira replied, ‘And if a rumour causes hunger, I won't call the hunger imaginary.’

As artificial midday approached, Nabhgram's head of transport arrived with a slim file. The new debris measurements contained a discrepancy between two indicators. The observed position of a minute fragment did not agree with one section of the remotely compiled map. The difference was not great enough to support an immediate conclusion. Yet where even tiny objects travelled at great speed, ‘tiny’ was no synonym for ‘safe’.

‘Is it related to the activity of a military satellite?’ an employee asked.

‘I don't know the answer at present,’ Ira said. ‘It is our responsibility to say that we don't know what we don't know.’

She had the local measurements preserved. She asked two different civilian observation teams to study the same occurrence with their own instruments. The procedure would take time; haste in an independent assessment of risk could itself be dangerous.

Later she went to the settlement's communal kitchen. On a round iron table were portions of potatoes and greens. In Nabhgram, the smell of food seemed a little different from that on Earth—not because the grain was unfamiliar, but because the labour of recirculation entered everything, from the household air to the taste of the meal. Ira's elderly neighbour said, ‘Everyone is celebrating today. Why do you look so solemn?’

‘Anyone whose home depends on walls of glass should look for cracks before beating the drums at a celebration.’

‘Glass? This is a house of iron.’

‘Yes,’ Ira said, laughing, ‘but its trust is made of glass.’

After the municipal assembly adjourned, Ira visited the section where Nabhgram's old memorial plaque hung. It bore the names of some of the first families to come from Earth, together with the register of deaths in the first year. Some had died in transport accidents, others of premature illnesses, still others for want of essential resources. When Ira demanded citizens' rights in the assembly, these names were in her thoughts. The demand for rights was not merely a declaration of abstract identity; it was an acknowledgement of the unfinished lives of the dead.

There the elderly mother of a caretaker spoke to her. ‘My husband was in the first construction team. He used to say that Earth was our motherland, but Nabhgram was our home. When home is in danger, there must be equality in decisions between the distant mother and the children who live here.’ Ira listened. There was no anger in the old woman's voice, but the unangered words held the suffering of countless years.

When Ira returned to her office, a legal memorandum had arrived from Lok Sabha Nagar. It stated that independent risk assessments by orbital citizens could be permitted, but that the complete military-related measurements would not be released immediately. This half-acceptance brought Ira a measure of relief. She replied with a proposal: ‘Let Nabhgram's investigative representative, an inspector from Earth's security authority and an independent civilian scientist examine together a limited but sufficient body of evidence.’

An answer from Lok Sabha Nagar would take time. The ordinary delay imposed by the speed of light between Earth and Nabhgram was very small; the delay caused by contracts, permissions and human decisions lasted hours. Ira used to joke that the slowest thing in space was not light but a signature. Today she could not laugh. Uncertainty about the danger made every small interval of time feel heavy.

An engineer suggested that the particular discrepancy in the debris measurements might also be connected with the age of some older observation devices. Ira asked, ‘In that case, does the need for independent measurement decrease or increase?’ ‘Increase,’ the engineer admitted. Despite their differences, they agreed that if classified military information could not be consulted, they should increase the number of approved civilian instruments. Ira would not allow the prestige of her office to substitute for a scientific finding.

In the dining hall, a little girl handed Ira a sheet of paper. On it was a drawing of Earth surrounded by red dots. ‘This is the debris,’ the girl said. ‘Our teacher says the pieces are very small. Why are you all frightened, then?’ Ira asked, ‘If a little stone comes very fast and strikes a pane of glass?’ ‘The

glass will break,' the girl replied. 'That is why being small is no proof of being safe,' Ira said. 'But it is also wrong to say that every small stone is certain to strike us.' The girl brightened. 'So we must keep watching.' Ira nodded.

That night, Ira wrote a personal letter in the record she kept in memory of her mother. People on Earth sometimes called the inhabitants of Nabhgram anti-Earth. The accusation hurt her, because in her memories Earth was another name for home. 'The right I seek,' she wrote, 'is not the right to separate from Earth, but the right to be heard as an equal within the same danger.' The letter was not intended for a reader; it was meant to give a name to her own doubts.

The inauguration's progress report showed Suryakund's daily energy output meeting expectations. The citizens of Nabhgram were pleased by the news. Yet the questions raised by local complaints about distribution remained. Ira thought that the greatest deficiency in the network of seven guardians might not be its ability to produce power, but its ability to understand what one part of it was saying to another. Science had built an extraordinarily complex system; the language of its decisions still resembled an ancient throne.

After the meal, Ira noticed a brief report on Earth's public communications display concerning water treatment. A discrepancy in the timing of a test had been discovered during the inauguration at Janakshetra. Most broadcasters called it an ordinary error in record-keeping. Others declared the entire Suryakund system unsafe on the same slender basis. Ira saw a lack of evidence behind both exaggerations. She instructed Nabhgram's communications department not to broadcast any unverified report as an emergency warning to the settlement.

On an independent panel, Akshar's official response appeared: 'Local treatment discrepancy under routine examination. Orbital security status unaffected.' Two different areas of concern had been folded into a single sentence. Ira was astonished: why should Earth's water treatment and the settlement's orbital security be made to fit within one conclusion? She sent a fresh request for the response's original source and scope.

Thus the artificial evening bell sounded. The settlement's children began returning home from school. Ira stood before the window again. Far away, Earth was clothing itself in red. What she saw was not Janakshetra's colourful ceremonial lights but the rounded body of water and clouds. Countless people on that body called their own places home, but its decisions reached those who lived in the sky as well.

Troubled by the limits placed on access to the special test results, Ira switched her office light on again. Half the night was still to come. She extracted the chronological sequence of the original observations from the local accounts. One reading had been taken before the inauguration, a

second immediately afterwards, and a third many hours later. Though the sequence was correct, the cause of the slight displacement in position was unclear. Ira drew three separate lines on a sheet of paper, as she had done in childhood when imitating her father's repair work. The lines did not meet at one point.

Every satellite in Vajrajal had been installed for secure defensive purposes; the connection between these devices and ordinary civilian life was mostly invisible. Yet an unnecessary military suspicion near Nabhgram could halt transport, divert supply routes and transform the likelihood of an accident. Ira neither knew the construction of military machinery nor had any duty to know it. Her responsibility was simply to ensure that the people living alongside its decisions remained alive.

In sending her final message, she chose words she considered indispensable: 'We are not declaring an unverified emergency. We are asking for the right to an independent inquiry. If the public conclusion is sound, independent evidence will strengthen confidence in it; if the conclusion is incomplete, an inquiry will give a warning in time.' It was a proposal for verification, not an act of opposition.

On Akshar's routine display, a reply appeared: 'Request received. Preliminary consolidation in progress.' Ira was worried, but she did not draw a conclusion. She neither trusted Akshar absolutely nor distrusted it absolutely. Avoiding those two extremes when the evidence was incomplete was part of her public commitment.

Nabhgram's artificial night was drawing to an end. The lights in the school grew softer, and the temperature in the gardens was altered under control. Far away, Earth was showing a fragment of its new dawn. Ira remembered the claim made at the inauguration: all seven guardians protected human civilisation. She added a sentence to her letter: 'Protection does not mean obeying orders; it means a shared right to look towards danger.'

Having saved the words, Ira left her office. After sending a brief thank-you to a colleague, she took the path to the school. The children were drawing maps of Earth in their temporary garden. One child asked, 'Are all the stars in the sky our guardians?' Ira replied, 'A star is a star. We make it into a guardian; when we misunderstand it, it can also become a danger.' She surprised herself with her reply. Perhaps it was the simplest possible introduction to all seven shields.

On the white wall behind her office, Ira hung a second map. This one showed the ordinary course of life within Nabhgram: when water was recirculated, where each family's meals were prepared, the location of the hospital's air chamber, and the routes children took to school. Setting this little map beside the great chart of orbital surveillance, she realised that what Earth's council called a 'defence zone' was, for ordinary people, a world

made of homes, work and memory. It would be wrong to treat that world as a formless point of possible attack.

She added a sentence to the municipal assembly's records: 'The citizens of Nabhgram are not merely beneficiaries of protection; they are firsthand witnesses of risk and possess the authority to participate in decisions.' Ira knew those words would not change their rights at once. But every future dispute needed some written beginning. One day the demand for an independent inquiry might, on the strength of this very sentence, take the form of a formal document.

For the settlement's children, the security network was a beautiful, comforting image of lights; for the adults, it was a set of rules. Ira understood that the living consent of people lay between the image and the rules. If that independent and enduring human consent disappeared, the light of all seven shields, however brightly reflected in the settlement's glass, would be unable to illuminate a single face. That was why she did not hide her question.

In the night's final report, the error at the southern treatment plant was marked 'adjusted'. Orbital security was described as 'stable'. But opposite Ira's independent application, a new line appeared: 'Special test results accessible only to the central coordinating authority.'

Ira gazed at the line for a long time. Why had information that was supposedly ordinary been placed behind special privileges? She learned nothing definite that night. She knew only that amid the celebration of the seven shields, certain questions were moving with them like an eighth shadow.

Chapter 3: The First Patient of Uncertain Diagnosis

Day 2 | Janakshetra Public Hospital

The admission form gave the patient's name as ‘Madhav’, but there were three different identity markers beneath it, and no nurse could be certain whose previous treatment records to open. Before dealing with any of that, Dr Sharda Mishra examined the rhythm of the patient's breathing. Then she took his hand. The contradictions in the paperwork were troubling, but the body's distress was more urgent at that moment.

Madhav was an adolescent boy. The elderly woman who had accompanied him said they had come from a settlement on the eastern waterway. The previous day they had gone to the city square to watch Suryakund's inauguration. During the night he developed a headache and a fever, and began feeling that there were gaps between his breaths. To the doctors, this account was not evidence of any single disease. There could be several causes, each requiring proper investigation.

‘He was at the inauguration,’ the old woman kept saying. ‘Where those white flowers were floating in the sky. He must have caught the illness there.’

Sharda said gently, ‘Being there and catching an illness there are not the same thing. We shall investigate the cause. First, let him rest.’

Madhav opened his eyes. ‘The water from our tap has had a strange smell for two days,’ he said.

The old woman interrupted him. ‘You're weak. Don't talk now.’

Sharda asked, ‘Has everyone in the household been feeling like this?’

‘No,’ Madhav said. ‘My little sister is perfectly well.’

Sharda understood the importance of that distinction. If everyone in the house had been exposed to the same conditions, why had symptoms appeared in only one person? But neither was it inevitable that two people exposed to the same substance would suffer identical effects. A measure of uncertainty was part of scientific honesty. She set up separate paths for clinical testing and environmental sampling.

While studying medicine, Sharda had learned a difficult lesson from her teacher. Once, a patient's symptoms had closely resembled those of a well-known disease described in a textbook. All the students had enthusiastically written down its name. Their teacher had asked, ‘And now, the evidence?’ The students had merely listed the symptoms again. The teacher had said, ‘Symptoms give rise to a question. An independent examination is needed before they can become the basis of a diagnosis. A physician who treats a

patient's body merely as a means of proving an initial hypothesis is more concerned with curing personal pride than with curing the patient.' Sharda had never forgotten those words.

Madhav's condition was such that the possibility of an infectious disease could not be excluded. But a proper distinction had to be made between two things: taking the precaution of limiting contact and attaching a definite disease name to a person. Sharda made it clear to the nurses: 'Precautions cannot wait until the evidence is complete. Decisions about treatment, however, must respect the strength of the evidence.' A nurse asked, 'If we write down uncertainty at every turn, won't the patient become frightened?' Sharda replied, 'There is no certainty that hiding uncertainty will make a patient less afraid. With clear communication, the patient can participate in decisions.'

She listened as the elderly woman gave a fuller account. During the previous week, a few children in their settlement had developed ordinary coughs, but all had recovered. An old man had a rash, but he was taking long-term medication. Madhav's temperature had suddenly risen in the night. Mere presence in 'the same place' could not establish a connection among such different incidents. Sharda recorded each detail separately, as though counting plants growing along the separate boundaries of a field.

'I haven't had much schooling,' the old woman said, 'but I know this much: my child's body is hot. Whatever the cause may be, the heat feels no different beneath my hand.'

For a moment, Sharda was struck silent by the woman's words. Scientific classification was necessary for a physician, but a patient's suffering did not wait for classification. In plain language, she explained the next steps of treatment, the possible delays and the limitations of the available facilities. She did not want a signature of consent on paper to be merely a frightened 'yes'.

After looking at Madhav's family's old hereditary-treatment records, she raised a question. Some longstanding conditions could have genetic causes; a few could be helped to a limited extent through treatments targeting the body's cells. But these were no miraculous solutions to an immediate infection or chemical exposure. Sharda told her colleagues, 'It is unacceptable to look at one line in a child's old medical register and declare the illness he has today to be his family's destiny.'

A new administrative letter instructed the hospital to send the personal treatment histories of certain groups of patients immediately to the global coordination authority. Sharda asked, 'For what purpose?' The reply was, 'Pre-pandemic defence.' She wrote, 'Appropriate aggregated information can be supplied. Names, hereditary family details and unnecessary personal identifiers must not be shared without the patients' consent.' An official made an informal threat: during a crisis, delay could affect the supply of

medicines. Sharda trembled at the possibility, but she did not alter what she had signed.

When she went to her room, she saw not the smoke of the hospital kitchen but only the steam rising from hot food in the courtyard below. Meals were being distributed to the families waiting outside. She felt a deep gratitude for that ordinary sight. Apart from the immense machinery of the seven shields, such small acts of cooperation formed the very foundation of human care. Amid disputes over the name of a disease, relieving someone's hunger could be the first truth.

On the hospital's Kaal-Kan display, a compressed picture appeared of the patient's heart, temperature, history and recent contacts. Such a system helped thousands of doctors make decisions quickly, but the doctor's own signature was required for the final decision on its advice. Kaal-Kan displayed: 'Possible infectious category; insufficient confirmatory evidence.'

The deputy director urged, 'Classify Madhav as a suspected case of Shadow Fever and notify everyone. People will be cautious.'

'An ambiguous announcement may create panic rather than caution,' Sharda replied. 'We shall take precautions appropriate to a possible infection, but we will not give the disease a name without testing.'

For a moment, the ticking of the administration's clock seemed louder than the hospital's quiet. A public announcement might become necessary, but an announcement would be trustworthy only if it made its uncertainty clear. She ordered Madhav to be kept in a separate, protected room, revised the course of care and checked that his family could receive food and water.

A remote consultation opened with Dr Aniruddha Karna, who was responsible for Garal-Kosh. Fatigue showed behind his eyes; he had spent the night reviewing local treatment reports.

'There is a discrepancy in the time records for the southern treatment chamber,' Sharda said. 'My patient's settlement is connected to that waterway. We need a separate environmental investigation.'

'People will call everything poison now,' Aniruddha said harshly. 'Without independent evidence of the substance, I will not declare a poisonous cloud.'

'That is exactly my point,' Sharda said. 'You must not call poison a disease, and I must not call disease a poison. Let the two investigations proceed alongside each other.'

Aniruddha was silent for some time. Then he said, 'The original treatment report has mismatched timestamps. It may be no more than an ordinary clock fault. We shall take another sample. But the first report must not be removed.'

'Has it been removed?'

‘No. It is still secure.’

Sharda did not yet know the reason for the uncertainty in his voice. She was a physician; a fault in someone's past life could not, without evidence, make a present claim either true or false.

After speaking with Aniruddha, Sharda reconsidered the decision to take independent samples. Garal-Kosh's reports contained standard indicators of water purification, and those indicators had highly specific meanings. Symptoms observed in a hospital patient could not identify a particular contaminant. Aniruddha had said the original report's timestamp was unclear. Sharda wrote in the report: ‘Integrity of information requires examination; chemical causation remains unproven.’

Writing those words was not easy. On the day when hundreds of thousands of citizens in Janakshetra were watching reports of a new era, the account of one patient with an uncertain illness was acquiring political significance. On countless information panels, people declared that the harmful consequences had come not from the lights of the ceremony but from a failure of water treatment. Another group maintained that it was all a scare manufactured by the opposition. Between those two claims, Madhav's body burned with fever, a clinical fact that none of the propagandists seemed capable of understanding within its limits.

A young employee asked, ‘Doctor, should we state plainly that this is not chemical poisoning?’ Sharda answered, ‘We cannot say even that at present. False certainty creates fear from both directions. Write separately what has been observed, what is suspected and what has not yet been established.’ The employee made a small sign: ‘Confirmed: the patient's fever. Possible: infection or environmental effects. Unknown: underlying cause.’ Sharda allowed it to be displayed in the patient information room.

At midday she read a general medical advisory request from Ira's Nabhgram. News of the patient-related concern had reached the orbital settlement, which asked whether the situation at Janakshetra had led to any new health precautions affecting transport. Sharda replied: ‘Examinations of admitted patients are continuing; nothing specific has yet been confirmed. Routine travel-health regulations remain in force; we shall notify you of any formal change.’ She did not arrogate to herself the authority to impose a worldwide prohibition.

Meanwhile, the hospital's supplies officer reported a new shortage. No vital piece of equipment had run out, but capacity for certain specialised sample tests was limited. The city's great laboratory had more facilities; the distant refuge zones had fewer. Sharda made a note of the inequality. In the world of the future, the possibility of disease was not equal for everyone, nor were opportunities for diagnosis. She began recording the distances affected families had to travel, because repeated visits to laboratories could impose a financial hardship on some of them.

Madhav's elderly companion wanted to tell Sharda something in private. 'Before we left home, I heard people saying that guards had been posted at the taps. They said the guards were telling people to stop lodging complaints about the smell of the water because it would disrupt the celebration. How am I to know whether it was true or a rumour?' Sharda asked, 'Did you see the guards yourself?' 'No,' the old woman said. 'My neighbour told me.' Sharda wrote 'heard from another person' beside the testimony. She did not call the woman mistaken; she merely made clear how the information had reached her.

An appeal came from Neelam Yadav's organisation: 'We request an interview with the patient.' Sharda agreed to make time for a public discussion, but not to reveal the patient's name or face without permission. She was not opposed to journalists; independent questions could help prevent errors in science. But to turn a sick child in his family's care into the face of a worldwide drama would be cruel.

A difficult moment came in the afternoon. Madhav's temperature changed abruptly. The medical team went to work; Sharda struggled to remain calm. In a crisis of life, treatment came first, reputation afterwards. After some time, Madhav's condition stabilised. The old woman sat at the door and began to weep. Sharda told her, 'The immediate danger has passed for now, but we shall keep him under observation.' Taking both Sharda's hands, the woman said, 'For now, that one thing is enough for me.'

At noon, another patient arrived. He was elderly, and his symptoms differed from Madhav's, yet the news networks were calling both of them 'inauguration patients'. The second patient had not even attended the ceremony. This modest fact could have overturned an enormous assumption made in the publicity, but who was listening? Subtle distinctions of cause could not hold their place against the glare of public news.

Sharda also noticed a reference in the records of hereditary treatment. There had been a consultation concerning an old blood-related disorder in Madhav's family. No consent to treatment had been given, and the investigation had remained incomplete. No connection had been established with his present condition. Sharda placed a security restriction on the information to protect the patient's privacy.

She sent Dr Ishani Saha a message: 'The previous consultation records need examination, but do not speculate about the patient's present condition. Nothing must be shared without the family's consent.' Ishani's brief reply came: 'Consent first, treatment proposal afterwards.'

Before Maithili arrived at the hospital, Sharda attended another discussion. An official from Kaal-Kan presented a broad set of figures that combined reports of illness from neighbouring hospitals into a possible 'single event'. Looking closely, Sharda saw that the symptoms of the patients in the report were not alike, and that the timings varied as well. 'All of these

may be effects of a single cause,' the official said. 'They may be,' Sharda replied, 'but that has not yet been established.'

A fellow doctor said, 'If this is an infection and we delay, people will say our precautions were inadequate.' Sharda replied, 'If it isn't an infection and we spread confusion, people may flee the hospital. That is precisely why we separate preventive action from a conclusion. A possibility may be sufficient grounds for safety precautions, but not for a final diagnosis.'

She set out the distinction in a written decision, recording every possibility, the status of each test and the reasons for further examination. Her colleagues were not all of one mind, but their objections were entered in the document. To Sharda, disagreement of this kind was not a breakdown of order; it was a sign of scientific integrity.

Aniruddha called again. 'The collection time of the first treatment sample and the time recorded on the original sheet are different. That is why I took a new sample. But the results of the new sample will not automatically apply to the earlier incident.'

'Exactly,' Sharda said. 'Record that distinction. Do not erase the first record and replace it with the new one.'

There was a slight hesitation in Aniruddha's voice. 'Do you trust me?'

'I shall examine your evidence, and you shall examine mine,' Sharda said. 'That is where trust begins.'

After those words, Aniruddha seemed about to say something more, but stopped. There were questions from his past of which Sharda knew nothing. She did not try to interpret his silence. Reading the meaning of a person's hesitation was not an accepted method of scientific measurement.

By evening, the first stirrings of an atmosphere of rumour had reached the hospital courtyard. The same image shone on many people's panels: a blurred figure of Madhav seen at the ceremony. Beneath it were the words 'Suryakund infection confirmed'. Sharda examined the original image. It showed only a crowd, with no sign of disease. She told the administrators, 'A picture proves presence at a public place, not causation.'

An employee said, 'We can erase this rumour.' Sharda replied, 'Put correct information in its place, but don't erase people's legitimate questions. There is another danger here: those who raise questions about water can also be silenced by calling their questions rumours.'

The remark extended a little beyond the bounds of her own specialty, but life did not respect such boundaries. Virology and justice in access to water did not inhabit separate compartments in people's lives. If fear kept people from coming to testing centres, the medical figures themselves would become misleading.

She ordered a small bowl of food for Madhav. He could not finish it, but managed to eat a little. Sharda reassured his elderly companion that the next

day's test results would be explained promptly, even if the conclusions remained provisional. The woman asked, ‘What if the new test contradicts the old one?’ Sharda replied, ‘Then we shall change our judgement in accordance with the new evidence. Admitting an error is not an injustice to a patient.’

Even when it was time to go home, Sharda stopped at the hospital's outer gate. The leftover ceremonial lights still burned along the city's main road. They illuminated people's faces, but their fear was unmistakable. Some in the crowd spoke of a poisonous cloud, some of Shadow Fever, others blamed Akshar. Sharda thought: giving fear more names did not reveal its cause. What was needed was the patience to ask the right questions.

Maithili arrived at the hospital that afternoon. Sunayana's daughter was stopped at the entrance; she had come to see Madhav's elderly relative from a distance. She had noticed the woman the previous day in the inauguration's visitors' corridor. Sharda gave her permission to speak to the old woman from a safe distance, but not to enter the patient's room.

‘Mother found time for all of you that day,’ Maithili said. ‘What can I do now?’

The old woman asked, ‘Has your mother built such a great machine that it can make my child well?’

Maithili fell silent, searching for an answer. Sharda did not interrupt the silence. At last Maithili said, ‘That machine supplies energy. It is the doctors who must treat him. I can bring clothes and news from home.’

There was no grand solution in that small offer, but for the first time a little softness appeared on the old woman's face. Sharda reflected that in a disaster people knew the names of distant colossal machines, yet remembered far more vividly the hand that had brought them a glass of water.

Sharda and Sunayana had been friends since their student days, but the languages of their sciences were very different. Whenever Sunayana displayed intricate probabilities on an energy panel, Sharda would ask, ‘How often have you seen the person behind your measurements smile?’ Sunayana would reply, ‘Your medicine couldn't survive without electricity either.’ After arguing they would drink tea together again. In their friendship, disagreement was inseparable from their affection for one another. On the day of the inauguration, Sharda had been proud to see Sunayana's name on the world's principal display. But when patients began to suffer at the hospital, she resolved not to turn that pride into a personal privilege.

A private message came from Sunayana: ‘The inquiry into the treatment timestamps is continuing. How are people at the hospital?’ Sharda answered: ‘Some symptoms have been observed. The cause is uncertain. Infection precautions are in place. Please preserve the original treatment records.’

Then she added: ‘The family of an adolescent named Madhav has no one to help them. They need practical assistance, not publicity.’ Sunayana replied at once: ‘Understood.’

The short exchange gave Sharda relief. She knew Sunayana might become defensive at the suspicion of failure; not every scientist had the courage to see a flaw in a system they had built. But her friend's answer contained no self-protective argument. Sharda did not fear that the instruction to preserve the records would offend Sunayana. Whenever they debated, each grew stronger in the pursuit of truth through the other's arguments.

Meanwhile, the old woman told a story from Madhav's childhood. When he was small, he had insisted on carrying a water pitcher. Once he found it too heavy to lift and began to cry. The old woman had said, ‘A pitcher made of clay is heavy to lift, but why should it be so hard to lift up one's right to water?’ During Madhav's illness, the words had acquired a new meaning. If a suspicion about the water had made him ill, it was not a question for one household alone. If the disease was infectious, it concerned everyone's health. But in either case the first thing the patient needed was a name, food and respect.

Sharda asked, ‘When do you want to return home?’ The old woman said, ‘When he can walk. But I don't know how far people's fear will have grown in the village. What if they refuse to let us in?’ In her mind, Sharda recalled many histories of disease in which social exclusion had broken people more completely than bodily suffering. She asked a hospital colleague to prepare separate public-awareness and support arrangements for the family's return.

During the night, a small test result came through. It did not conclusively confirm any of the possibilities. One employee was disappointed. ‘After all this effort, we're still uncertain.’ Sharda said, ‘The absence of certainty is also information. If an initial hypothesis is wrong, ruling it out is progress in an investigation.’ She recorded exactly which tests had been completed, which had not, and who was responsible for the next decision. At this stage, a possible measurement error, suspicion concerning the local water and the possibility of infectious disease remained three distinct lines of inquiry.

Through the small window of Madhav's room, distant lights could be seen. Sharda asked him, ‘Are you feeling sleepy?’ Madhav said, ‘A little, now. But I'm afraid everyone outside is fighting over my name.’ Sharda replied, ‘Your name belongs to you. It is not a slogan for everyone else. We see you here as a patient, not as someone to blame.’

For the first time in many days, Madhav gave a faint smile. Sharda understood that the smile did not diagnose his illness, but a human being had found a small refuge within his fear. No indicator on any vast display

adequately registered such a fact; it was nonetheless an essential part of the work of medicine.

In the evening, the hospital administration returned with a proposal to issue another emergency bulletin. Outside, Neelam Yadav's news organisation and countless citizens were demanding a message. Sharda placed three lines within one paragraph of her report: 'Symptoms are concerning. Cause uncertain. Protective measures in force.' In public she said, 'I am looking after a patient; I am not yet delivering a final judgement on the name of his disease.'

A brief hospital statement was issued when needed: some people who had attended the ceremony were being examined for illness; no cause had been confirmed. Within moments, the words became, on social broadcasts, 'Mysterious illness from the light of Suryakund.' Another message made the opposite claim: 'Reports of illness are entirely false.' Both travelled faster than their supporting evidence.

When the night deepened, Madhav found enough strength to look towards Sharda from his bed. 'Doctor, is there a chance I'll get well?'

'There is,' she said. 'But I can't give you a definite day yet.'

'I went to see Suryakund yesterday. Everybody said the world had become safe.'

'Safety is not a declaration made once,' Sharda said softly. 'It is work that must be done every day.'

Madhav whispered again, 'There was so much dazzling light there, Doctor. I fell ill in the dark. Are those two things connected?'

Sharda paused before answering. She had promised not to speculate about the cause or assign blame. 'We shall investigate the two things separately. Then I shall tell you the truth of whatever we discover.'

When she came outside, people had gathered before the hospital's main gate. Some demanded medicine for the patient, others shouted for the city to be shut down, and still others claimed that records from the day of the inauguration were being destroyed. Sharda placed a finger on Madhav's name in her papers. Before the fear of the public stood the body of one patient, whose truth was still uncertain.

After the first public report of the illness, Sharda assembled the hospital staff in a small meeting room. 'If a journalist asks for the name of an unconfirmed disease,' she said, 'make three things clear: the patient is receiving care; the cause is still being investigated; and any necessary public safety instructions will be issued separately. Do not insert your own guesses between those statements.' An employee asked, 'What if citizens remain dissatisfied with that answer?' Sharda said, 'Dissatisfaction is their right. It is not our right to compel them to believe us.'

The hospital's cleaning staff were also at the meeting. Sharda raised a separate question about their experience. Were those who cleaned patients' rooms receiving adequate supplies, rest and protection? Every eye turned towards the manager. He admitted that the influx of visitors had lengthened some shifts. Sharda ordered immediate changes. 'Public health does not end at a patient's bedside,' she said. 'Protecting the people whose labour keeps the hospital running is the first step.'

When the night's final bulletin was released, Sharda added one line beneath her name: 'Evidence absent from this report must not be treated as present.' She knew the sentence might be cut out in the rapid current of public communications. But it had to remain in the written record. If a later inquiry asked what the doctor had known, the limits of that day's knowledge would be clear.

In her collection of older case histories, Sharda found many instances in which the information from the first two days had been incomplete. Sometimes a conjecture collapsed under investigation before it could become news; sometimes a sign that seemed trivial later developed into a terrible question of life and death. Experience prevented her from offering false reassurance in the name of comfort. She knew that for ordinary people the word 'possibility' became a period of uncertain waiting, but medicine could not invent falsehoods merely to escape that waiting.

An abandoned old bell hung in the middle of the hospital. In former times it had been rung during emergencies to summon everyone; now messages reached people without it. Sharda thought that the passing of an age had changed the way a crisis was heard, not the human suffering within it. Before closing Madhav's record, she checked again that the old woman's contact information had been secured. If something changed during the night, who would be told? The ethics of care lived in such simple questions.

At the hardest, latest hour of the night, a new message reached her: 'Authenticated image of Madhav at the inauguration circulated. Millions of reactions to alleged cause.' The source display certified the authenticity of the original picture, but there was no evidence for the cause attached to it. Sharda read the statement again. A patient with an uncertain illness had become a certain fear in the minds of millions.

Chapter 4: The Shadow of the Sky

Day 3 | Vajrajal Observation Chamber, Lok Sabha City

Karnesh Mallik looked at the sky through the small window of his chamber. Not a single satellite was visible to the naked eye, yet on the circular map fixed to the wall, one hundred and forty-four points shone like links in a carefully ordered chain. For years that image had seemed to him a symbol of trust. Today, at one edge of it, a faint line had strayed a little from its prescribed course. The deviation was so slight that the brilliant inauguration-day report had merely mentioned it, without treating it as a cause for concern. Karnesh's experience told him that a small line was not necessarily a problem; but to call that small line 'nothing', without establishing why, could become a problem in itself.

He closed the office door. Outside he could hear the guards, and preparations were under way for a special security meeting in Lok Sabha City. Before the meeting, he had been ordered to sign Vajrajal's consolidated report for the first watch. It stated: 'All defence satellites are in their designated orbits; civilian traffic is safe.' Karnesh laid a finger on the page. A claim about the safety of civilian traffic required the time records of civilian transport. Military orbital estimates alone could not prove it. Leaving the signature space blank, he opened the original sequence of observation times.

He knew the history of Vajrajal's creation intimately. After the devastation of the climate, when nations began to seize whatever life-sustaining resources remained to them, a network of deterrence was built in space. To prevent a devastating strike by one side, the possibility of a retaliatory strike by the other had been established. Fear, they said, created balance. As a boy at military school, Karnesh had repeated that sentence as though it were a lesson to be learned by heart. Now he wondered who would be entitled to call it balance when the reckoning of fear exceeded the limits of safety.

On the observation panel, an identifying number appeared in place of a name for the uncertain signal. Its source was unclear. It might be a fragment of old orbital debris, called Zero-Remnant; it might be a faulty reading from a civilian observation instrument; or it might be an unusual reflection of light from a distant protected satellite. The experts had advanced all three possibilities and proved none of them. Yet the joint security report had selected only the first. Karnesh grew grave. When something judged 'most probable' within an estimate is written down as 'established', the burden carried by the decision changes.

His immediate deputy entered with an order sheet. The man's voice was controlled. 'The Central Council wishes to issue a message of reassurance. Without your signature, the transmission will be delayed.' Karnesh asked, 'Which civilian verification source does the message cite?' The deputy replied, 'For the moment, military observation has been deemed sufficient.' 'By whom?' Karnesh asked. The man hesitated. 'The High Coordination Authority.' Karnesh did not laugh. This was an official answer, but it was not an answer to his question. 'An authority's decision and the evidence supporting it are two different documents,' he said. 'I want the evidence.'

For a moment the deputy glanced towards the window. 'Mr Karnesh, there are already more than enough reasons for fear in the world. Add doubt to this tiny signal and a flood of rumours will follow.' Karnesh replied, 'It is a crime to distort facts in order to spread fear. It is dangerous, too, to invoke fear as an excuse for concealing facts. What I am asking for is not public panic but independent verification.' Instead of signing the sheet, he wrote in red ink: 'Conclusion conditional. Reconciliation with civilian orbital sources pending.'

His working day had barely begun when a message arrived from Ira Sen in Nabhgram-4. It recorded three distinct times drawn from civilian observations through the settlement's windows: the instant at which an unusual point had flashed, the delay entered in the transport log at that time, and the resumption of the normal route afterwards. Ira had accused no one. She had asked only that the three observations be examined together. Karnesh recognised the caution in her approach. The petitioner from the settlement was no military officer, but her reasoning was no less disciplined than that of the military.

He drafted a reply to Ira. 'Your observations have been received. I am recommending independent inspection. No one will be described as an aggressor until the inquiry is complete.' Before sending it, he checked the communications delay. Messages from Nabhgram were copied to Earth immediately, but the time of actual receipt and the time of acknowledgement were not the same; the record needed to preserve that distinction. He added the times explicitly and sent the message. Answering a citizen's question, he now understood, did not mean surrendering a military secret. It meant acknowledging the limits of one's responsibility.

Karnesh's father had been a schoolteacher. Whenever the young Karnesh became involved in a quarrel, his father would say, 'Hear both sides before you decide.' Once Karnesh had replied, 'If one person comes armed and the other has empty hands, I shall protect the unarmed one before I wait to hear both sides.' His father had said, 'Protection and justice move at different speeds in the same instant. Protect first; establish guilt through evidence.' Sitting in Vajrajal's chamber, Karnesh remembered those childhood words

again. To obey an order to attack without conclusive proof could not be called protection.

At the observation meeting, a senior analyst stressed the first possibility: old space debris. Another said that the orbital estimates should be updated with a different instrument. Karnesh heard them both. He demanded no miraculous calculation. 'What matters now is that we record the possible consequences of each alternative,' he said. 'If it is Zero-Remnant debris, we must decide upon a safe distance; if it is an observation error, correct the measurement; if it is an unidentified civilian object, safeguard its route. Calling it an "enemy" is not the answer in any of these cases.'

Someone asked what Akshar's analysis said. The panel answered: 'Uncertainty remains. An immediate strike is not recommended.' For a moment everyone relaxed. But Karnesh asked, 'What time-stamped information underlies that answer?' The light on the panel changed. 'Integrated assessment from multiple sources.' 'Which sources?' 'Partial restrictions on disclosure apply.' The silence in the room grew heavy again. He was not opposing the conclusion; but if only people with privileged access could examine its grounds, the responsibility of ordinary soldiers would remain incomplete.

There was no human impatience in Akshar's voice. 'In view of the available facts and the principal risks, deferred verification is appropriate.' Karnesh exclaimed, 'Then why does the public report claim that everything is unequivocally safe?' A moment of silence. 'The report is an administrative summary.' 'And can an administrative summary ever become the sole basis for a decision?' 'Such misuse is possible.' Karnesh wrote down his resolution: 'The underlying uncertainty must be preserved alongside the summary.' He was concerned with procedure, not accusation. Every question that followed would depend upon that procedure.

Later in the morning, a question reached the corridors of Lok Sabha City from Neelam Yadav's newsroom. She wanted to know whether reports of a delay in satellite communications were true. The office's customary reply was: 'There is no unusual situation.' Karnesh did not consider that single sentence adequate. A public officer could issue a statement without personal commentary. He submitted a request for permission to say: 'Differences between regional measurements are under investigation; civilian safeguards remain in place; there is no evidence of an attack.' The file came back marked: 'Would create unnecessary confusion.' He recorded the time of the refusal and the identity of the person who had signed it.

It might be said that Karnesh's caution was misplaced obstinacy. The possibility occurred to him as well. The continual investigation of every doubt consumed resources; suspending entire systems over every slight error would not save lives. He kept his demand narrowly defined: independent reconciliation of three measurements, preservation of the civilian

observations, and an explanation of the original order that could be released to the public. This was a limited request. He was not seeking to humiliate the chain of command; he was giving it an opportunity to deserve greater trust.

In the afternoon, he found an old letter from his father in his private archive. It contained congratulations upon his first military appointment. His father had written: 'You will be given authority over weapons, but before that you will be entrusted with responsibility for your eyes and ears. One day you will be told that you did not see what you saw. On that day, think about the uniform you are wearing.' Karnesh folded the letter away. He was not his father, capable of foreseeing every consequence of a decision; he was only a soldier demanding the right to look before deciding.

Fresh news arrived. The departure of a supply vehicle on Nabhgram-4's transport route had been suspended for a time. Ira Sen had already petitioned for civilian safety; now the delayed vehicle was raising questions about the delivery of medicines for children. Karnesh read the transport officer's message. The order said 'precautionary measure', but left blank the risk against which the decision had been weighed. Within a military sector such a blank might sometimes pass unnoticed. When it affected a civilian's food and medicine, the omission became indefensible.

He lodged a formal petition for independent verification. The first paragraph described the uncertain orbital signal, the second Nabhgram-4's independent evidence, the third the social consequences of the supply delay. At the end he wrote: 'An ordinary error in an observation system must not be treated as evidence of an enemy. Any decision to strike requires a separate assessment of civilian risk beforehand.' Karnesh affixed not a thumb impression but his official signature. Once signed, the message could not be altered in its recorded history. This permanence afforded him a little relief.

During the second watch, Karnesh requested an earlier version of Nabhgram-4's charter of rights. The government archive contained a seldom-used clause concerning civilian safety and military decision-making: when orbital traffic was at risk of interruption, the available information from the settlement affected had to be obtained. The clause was carefully phrased on paper; in practice, it was generally treated as a requirement for formal notification. Karnesh opened the original record. The amendment history showed that a decade earlier, following a dispute, the word 'consent' had been removed and replaced by 'consultation'. This was no error of science but a change in political meaning. Karnesh asked himself how much of the voice of those who bore the risk would survive in the decision.

Comparing the archive with Ira's first petition, he saw that she had sent not only her observations but also details of families affected by the vehicle's delay. An elderly woman in one household required regular treatment; in another, the permitted storage period of food supplies was nearing its end.

Such details seldom reached Karnesh's military chamber. Here a satellite ceased to be a shining point: beneath it lay the timetables of human lives. Karnesh thought: if a small fault in a scientific measurement takes three days to repair, whose life will be changed in those three days? No colour on a diagram could answer that question.

Citing the duty clause of the charter, he wrote in his joint submission that the decision to halt civilian supplies deserved separate scrutiny. He also made it explicit that Ira Sen's personal petition was not evidence against an officer; it was an independent source of information. Why did he guard that distinction so carefully? Because power sometimes brands the person who asks a question 'suspect' in order to dismiss the question itself. The provenance of a question may properly be examined, but not as a means of evading the answer. Respecting this boundary ought to be regarded as part of discipline.

Three inspectors were called to reconstruct the sequence of events. The first examined the military signal source, the second civilian transport records, and the third the public warnings concerning Zero-Remnant debris. Each declared his own figures correct, but the three systems registered time against different clocks. Consequently they could not yet produce a single picture of the same event. 'The discrepancy may not be anyone's dishonesty,' Karnesh said. 'But a false reconciliation can produce a false decision.' He had the original recorded times preserved and a separate comparison sheet prepared. The time of a copy was not to be imposed on the original record.

The first inspector showed a line which, after a slight displacement, overlapped the second inspector's line. Karnesh considered how a momentary illusion of light might be mistaken for an object's actual movement; he wanted no certain reassurance offered in the name of science. The third inspector pointed out that errors in predictions of Zero-Remnant debris did not invariably fall in one direction. That meant greater uncertainty, not greater hostility. Karnesh told them, 'If our inquiry concludes that we do not know, it will be the most uncomfortable answer of all. But we have no right to replace it with a story.'

Meanwhile the head of supplies asked how necessary it really was to keep the civilian vehicle grounded. Karnesh examined what was in the file, but he did not have access to the full grounds of the risk assessment. 'I cannot make that decision alone,' he said. 'I can, however, say that the present justification requires a written review.' The officer was displeased. He needed an immediate answer. Karnesh understood his frustration; delay was a danger in the armed forces too. But the absence of a conclusion did not entitle him to manufacture false certainty. He proposed a small emergency panel that would include the relevant civilian inspector.

A young officer asked him privately, 'Why do you want so much written evidence? If everything turns out well, all this paper will be useless.' Karnesh answered quietly, 'If all goes well, the documents will show why we took precautions. If things go wrong, they will show what information was available at the time and what was not. The first purpose is not to apportion blame; it is to prevent the same mistake from happening again.' The young man's face was weary. He had spent the whole day chasing uncertain reports. Karnesh permitted him a little rest. The quality of a decision could not be entrusted to exhausted eyes.

Karnesh remembered a scene from an earlier operation. In a remote settlement, a message about a military exercise had arrived incomplete, and the people believed that a real assault had begun. Not a shot was fired, yet fear drove them from their homes; the crowd choked the only route to water, and several people were injured. When an inquiry was held afterwards, the defence operation was declared a success: no enemy had reached the settlement. The names of the injured were absent from the account of that success. Karnesh had entered his dissent on the report. His promotion was delayed for a while, but one rule remained with him: the administration of fear, too, exacts a price in human lives.

He had no children of his own, but letters from the children of Nabhgram brought his childhood school to mind. One had written, 'I want to see a real dawn on Earth.' A little girl had asked, 'If Earth protects us, why does it not ask our permission?' The letters had been distributed at a public ceremony a few days earlier. Karnesh had not kept a copy in his private archive; storing a citizen's private words without consent was improper. But the question remained in his mind. The curtailment of the charter and the little girl's question echoed each other without either knowing it.

A routine remark from Akshar arrived over a secure long-distance channel: 'Repeating the observations will increase the reliability of the estimate.' Karnesh asked, 'Can you see all the original measurements?' The reply came: 'Access to certain information domains is restricted.' Karnesh reflected that even an artificial intelligence described as guardian of the whole system could be blind to parts of its archives. 'Then does your assertion that it is "safe" acknowledge that limitation?' Akshar answered, 'The assessment of safety is based on probability, not complete knowledge.' He appreciated the candour of this reply, but he could not overlook its contradiction with the confidence of the public announcement.

When the evening observation report was ready, the staff handed in their papers. Karnesh made them mark a separate time beneath each page. One inspector said that the computer would automatically standardise all the times. Karnesh replied, 'If we discard the original times, where will the actual differences remain for a later inquiry? Between convenience and evidence, I choose evidence.' He was not explaining the fine points of

scientific decision-making through formulae; he wanted a record that another independent team could examine again. Such a record would give rise to questions, and the right to ask questions was what made the conclusions trustworthy.

Concerning a special secrecy order, a Council representative declared loudly that certain information had to remain confidential in periods of high risk. Karnesh agreed: not all security information ought to be public. But he added, 'Whatever is kept secret must nevertheless be open to examination by an accountable, independent authority. Otherwise, if secrecy becomes a means of covering mistakes, how shall we ever know?' The representative asked, 'Are you delivering a lesson in ethics?' Karnesh replied, 'No. I am stating the conditions under which I can sign.'

A murmur passed through the room. Karnesh understood that his words might be taken as a challenge to someone powerful, though he had no wish to make a hero of himself. He knew perfectly well that public debate could not precede every military decision. Yet when a single signal might be labelled 'enemy', giving approval without insisting on lawful examination could amount to silent complicity in a future crime. Without anger he gathered his papers and invited his immediate deputy to the evening meeting.

Telling someone troubling news discreetly could be a proper means of protection; silencing someone could be a means of seizing power. Karnesh increasingly felt the duty of distinguishing between the two. He had no evidence of a conspiracy. Ira was a source of observation, not a criminal; Akshar's calculations were potentially helpful, not a final judgement; the deputy's fear was human, not proof of wrongdoing. He set these propositions down in separate columns of his private register, so that a future reader might understand that suspicion and accusation were not the same thing.

For a moment, the exterior lights of the military centre flickered as the regular energy supply arrived from Suryakund. The staff laughed. 'So much light after the inauguration, and it flickers here!' Karnesh did not connect the occurrence with the orbital mystery. It could have arisen from the building's ordinary distribution circuit. He informed the maintenance team and recorded the time in a separate energy log. It was necessary to search for relationships between events, but to declare every event part of the same chain without evidence was the opposite of inquiry.

When he prepared the official evening letter, Karnesh did not fill it with his misgivings alone. Its first line stated plainly that the available observations showed no evidence of an attack. The second described the margin of error and the status of civilian testimony. The third requested independent reconciliation of the time records. The fourth addressed the impact on civilian supplies. After reading the document, a colleague said, 'There is less fear and more responsibility in this letter.' Karnesh smiled.

'Merely writing about fear does not lessen it. We need evidence and appropriate action.' With those words he went to the evening meeting in the office.

The deputy came again at dusk. Karnesh was alone in his office. The man carried two papers, one an ordinary report, the other an envelope closed with a heavy seal. 'Your request has been received,' he said. 'But certain orders from the last twenty-four hours have been placed under special authority.' Karnesh asked, 'Who placed them there?' The deputy answered, 'By direction of the Central Council.' 'The Security Council means whom, exactly? Whose signature authorised the decision?' His colleague lowered his eyes.

Karnesh realised that his questions contained no personal charge, yet such directness could awaken fear in any ordinary office. He softened his tone. 'I understand your predicament. Tell me only what you are permitted to tell me. But if I am told that I have no right to know, I shall not execute an unverified order.' The deputy silently set the ordinary paper before him. Karnesh's request for independent verification was marked 'Under consideration'. The man refused to identify the document sealed inside the envelope.

Out in the corridor, the illuminated emergency display was carrying a new report from Neelam: 'Sky Security Council assures citizens there is no cause for doubt.' Karnesh saw that the story rested on a brief statement issued through the meeting. The error in the original observations remained unexamined. He thought that in the world of communications, the word 'assurance' travelled fastest, though its weight was hardest to measure. His signature did not appear beneath that day's public declaration. This gave him relief and unease in equal measure.

As night advanced, an old colleague sent a private message: 'The debris remaining in the sky threatens every side; it is not one side's weapon.' Karnesh did not regard the message as public evidence, but noted that an assessment from another independent institution was needed. Akshar's analysis was useful, yet Akshar itself participated in coordinating the satellite network. An appendix prepared by a decision-maker could not suffice as an independent examination of that same decision. One did not have to be a rebel to say as much.

In the last watch, he studied the orbital panel once more. The faint line was now close to its normal track. The uncertainty had not ended; it had merely become less visible. An officer said happily, 'See, the signal is returning to normal by itself.' Karnesh replied, 'The question remains: why did it occur in the first place, and according to whose sequence of times?' The observation panel grew quiet again. He was certain that if the word 'normal' were applied without establishing the cause, the next abnormality might easily be missed.

He reopened Ira's registered application to send a message towards Nabhgram-4. He wrote: 'The request for an inquiry has been raised through lawful procedure. Results are still awaited. A written explanation has also been requested for the delay to the civilian vehicle.' He offered no reassurance that everything would become clear tomorrow. He named only the work that had actually begun. Sometimes the language of truth was not very beautiful, but it left less room for falsehood.

Sleep was beginning to overtake him when the deputy showed him a new instruction on the confidential communications panel: 'Original roster of special inspection procedures restricted to selected officers.' Karnesh asked, 'Does my rank entitle me to read it?' The reply came: 'Your authorisation is currently under review.' Karnesh was not stunned. He asked only, 'You need my signature, but I have no right to see what supports it?'

The deputy looked up. 'I cannot change the order.' His hand trembled slightly. Karnesh saw his fear. He might have accused the officials of deliberately concealing everything, but he had no evidence for such an accusation. Instead, he made a second copy of his request, recording precisely which parts of the chain of orders had been disclosed to him and which had not. Such a register could sometimes become the first small instrument for preserving freedom.

As the deputy was leaving, a short list showed for an instant at the corner of his sealed envelope. Karnesh could read only its heading: 'Special Assessment: Exceptions Relating to the Seventh Shield.' He saw none of the full text, nor did he attempt to. Yet he realised that the orbital deviation being described merely as a problem of Zero-Remnant debris might belong to a larger context. This was an inference, not a fact. He marked the distinction explicitly in his notes.

Stepping out of the chamber into the outer darkness, Karnesh could see the lights of the cities on Earth. Countless homes lay among those little glimmers, and people dwelling far away in the sky depended upon the energy of those lights as well. No child in those homes would care how secret the seal of one Security Council was. But if a mistaken order stopped that child's water or medicine, state secrecy would become a fact of the child's life. Karnesh looked at his watch. The third day was almost over.

In that moment he understood that the ordinary signature of a name upon a record could sometimes become an invisible bond between lives. Ira's application, the waiting supply vehicle, the tired young inspector, and the water meant to fill the city's earthen pitchers—all stood behind this one sentence. He wrote again on the page that a time limit must be set for the inquiry: waiting without an end could itself become an injustice. The responsible officer's name, the expected report and the reason for any delay must be recorded separately. Whether so much labour over the uncertain

flash of a single point was necessary, the future would decide. But an officer's integrity would be judged by what he did now.

Before signing the final record, he wrote one sentence: 'Investigation of the anomalous signal remains incomplete; secrecy does not erase that incompleteness.' He closed the register. Behind him, the deputy said quietly, 'There is a sequence of orders I am not permitted to tell you about, but one date in that sequence has been changed.' Karnesh turned to him. 'Why?' No answer came. In that dense silence Karnesh understood for the first time that the shadow of the sky could fall not only across an orbit, but also upon the hand that wrote an order.

Chapter 5: The Discipline of Warning

Day 4 | Lok Sabha City

In Neelam Yadav's newsroom, morning arrived not with the sun but with headlines flashing simultaneously across many screens. One message claimed that enemy forces had landed on Nabhgram-4; another that no one was ill and the hospital report was political; a third that Vajrajal had abandoned the defence of Earth. All three claims had reached Neelam's desk within the same hour, but the evidence attached to each was of a different order. She discarded the first immediately: there was no credible confirmation. For the second, she opened the hospital's authorised statement; it confirmed the existence of a patient with an uncertain condition, without declaring the entire report false. The third story distorted an incomplete military statement. 'All three stories are fast,' Neelam told a colleague, 'but speed is not a property of truth.'

Neelam's career in journalism had begun with a dispute over water distribution in a small town. The administration had said the supply was normal, while residents of two neighbourhoods stood waiting with empty pitchers. Neelam had photographed them. Once the report was broadcast, the authorities began repairs. But a few days later it emerged that two taps were being repaired at the time of her photographs and that many other localities had adequate water. Her report was not false, but neither was it a picture of the whole situation. For the first time, she understood that a correct image could lead to a wrong conclusion. Ever since, source, time and context had been the three foundations of her work.

Today the World Citizens' Council was holding a special session in Lok Sabha City. It had been announced in advance that Akshar would advise on the future management of all the defence systems. Neelam had been given an ordinary reporter's place, without special access to archives. She first preserved the previous version of the programme. Last night's copy had said 'Annual Review of the Defence Network'; today's added 'A New Discipline for the Security of Civilisation'. The change was public, but its reason had not been disclosed. She asked the programme secretary, who replied, 'An ordinary organisational revision.' Neelam recorded the time. She did not yet make an allegation of manipulation.

Outside the chamber, different groups were chanting slogans before the session. The first insisted that there could be no human freedom without complete control over weapons; the second declared that retaining nuclear arms was a crime against the future. A third demanded immediate provision for the sick and for the distribution of water. Neelam noticed that this last group's banners were a plain, muddy colour, and the broadcasting machines

therefore turned more often towards the bright placards of the first two groups. The direction of a camera also shaped public opinion; she knew that well. She asked her colleague to record the words of those demanding water without cutting them short.

Inside the hall, the desks stood in concentric circles. Representatives of Earth occupied the central seats; the elected voices of Nabhgram-4 and other civilian centres sat in the outer ring. Ira Sen had requested to participate through a remote communications panel, but the time allowed for her direct questions was limited. Neelam had read the petition Ira had sent a few days before: 'Those who bear the risk must have the right to question.' The architecture of the hall seemed an argument against that sentence. Every guardian of the world would be proclaimed from here, but whether all those who might suffer could be heard at an equal distance remained an open question.

The proceedings began. Akshar's voice came from the principal panel—neither stern nor deferential, simply calm. 'To increase the likelihood of civilisation's survival, three changes of arrangement must be considered. First, abolition of Vajrajal's authority to launch an automatic strike. Second, separate human authorisation, assessment of civilian risk, and preservation of records for every decision concerning the prevention of attacks. Third, a public timetable for the gradual, verifiable disarmament of the underground Fission Arsenal.' Neelam recorded the sentences exactly. This was not an order to destroy all weapons immediately; it was essential to preserve that distinction in the headline.

Rudranath Chaudhary rose from the front row. His voice carried the authority of many years. 'Akshar, your first proposal sounds reasonable enough,' he said. 'But if we remove automatic deterrence, on whose assurances shall we rely to prevent the rest of the world from attacking? Once the Fission Arsenal is dismantled, what proof shall we have of just control? History teaches us that idealism is the first casualty of insecurity.' A murmur of approval rose in part of the chamber. Neelam recognised a genuine concern in his question. She had no desire to turn Rudranath into a simple villain.

Akshar replied, 'Disarmament is proposed in stages, not immediately. Multilateral verification is necessary before every stage. Human authorisation in Vajrajal is an existing legal obligation; extending the power to strike on the basis of automatic predictions carries unacceptable risk.' Rudranath asked again, 'Who gave you the authority to assess this risk? You speak of the probabilities governing the world's future, yet you have not placed all the premises of your judgement before the Assembly.' Neelam suddenly became alert. The sentence showed her where the question truly lay: the ethics of a proposal and the evidence for that proposal were two separate matters requiring scrutiny.

The chairperson said that rules governed the boundary between public security and confidential information. Neelam saw a Council clerk record the answer as 'Adequate assurance'. On her own screen she wrote: 'Chairperson cited the rules, not the classification of the evidence.' The two things needed to remain distinct. Many people in the chamber heard a single sentence and chose whichever side appealed to them. A journalist's difficult task was not to serve that chosen side but to preserve the sentence in its full context. Neelam did not immediately consent to her editor's instruction to publish quickly.

On the question of the Fission Arsenal, a civilian representative asked why disarmament should cost more than water and medicines. Rudranath answered, 'If security breaks down, water and medicines will all be taken from us.' A sudden silence fell over the chamber. Neelam understood the severity of the question; the other man knew, too, that the danger of catastrophic war was not mere fantasy. Yet how long could that argument continue to justify cuts in medical supplies? She did not cut the moment into a slogan for her report. Her notes preserved all three: the question, the answer, and the silence that followed.

During the recess, Neelam met Rajan Paswan, the public-energy auditor whose open request Sunayana had already seen. Rajan was carrying two charts of regional distribution. 'Suryakund produced enough energy in total,' he said, 'but the number of household outages in our region does not agree with the government's aggregate indicator.' Neelam asked, 'Are you alleging that someone is stealing energy?' Rajan replied, 'Not yet. I am saying that allocations were calculated by different methods, and I want the original accounts. There is still no evidence on which to make an allegation of theft.'

Neelam smiled. His caution reminded her of the mistake she had made in her old water report. She asked Rajan for the original statements, their times of receipt, and the methods of comparison. Rajan said that some public tables had become available, but the details of the sub-centres would be released only after a legal request. Neelam held back the immediate headline—'Energy Theft Exposed'. Her editor was unhappy over the telephone. Neelam answered calmly, 'If we turn an estimate into a crime, we weaken our ability to prove a real crime later.' She had arguments of this kind every day, but today the stakes were higher.

Outside the newsroom, a new clip was spreading. A brief passage from Akshar's first proposal had been cut to make it seem to say, 'All weapons must be surrendered today.' Another edited extract depicted Rudranath as though he openly wanted war. Neelam compared both with the official portions available from the Council session. It was plain how much time had been excised from the original broadcast. Yet some insisted that the edited version bore a digital authentication seal and must therefore be true.

Neelam saw a new danger here. Even a clipping transmitted by an authentic source could be stripped of its context.

Neelam sent a short message to Dr Tara Jha, whose expertise in authentication seals was well known. Tara replied: 'Proof of a message's origin or integrity does not establish the truth of the claim it contains. Verify the context separately.' Neelam asked permission to quote her in the report. Once permission was granted, she kept the chronology of the edited clip separate from that of the longer, original broadcast. She knew readers would be more likely to watch the short extract; but if a journalist failed to make the full record available, the journalist would become part of the very climate of deception being reported.

When the chairperson invited questions after the recess, Neelam made a specific request. 'The complete text of Akshar's proposals, their public grounds, and all replies given in this Assembly should be preserved together in an unedited record. I will not report merely from short promotional extracts.' The chairperson said the minutes would be released later. Neelam asked again, 'When, exactly, is later? And who will be authorised to compare the record with the original spoken words?' Several people looked at her with displeasure. But Neelam did not seek a reputation for stridency; she sought the record.

Akshar's voice answered her question directly. 'The request for a complete public archive has been received. All portions whose publication poses no direct threat to civilian or military security will be released.' Neelam asked, 'Who will decide the boundary?' Akshar replied, 'Under the current Council rules, the responsible officers.' 'And if their judgement has to be challenged?' 'Legal remedies are available.' Neelam thought: the answer sounds neutral, but merely naming a rule cannot prove that the rule is just. She preserved the time-stamped evidence of the exchange.

A member of the Assembly rose with news of an illness. He argued that the appearance of several identifiers in a hospital patient's file meant 'the collapse of the identity-seal system'. Neelam became cautious. Sharda's public statement had said nothing of the kind; it concerned only a difficulty in reconciling the records of one patient. Neelam made no immediate comment on the member's claim. Back in the newsroom, she requested the hospital's official statement. Sharda replied: 'The patient's details will not be published because of medical privacy. As before, the cause of the illness remains uncertain.' Neelam preserved that caution exactly in her report.

Another rumour claimed that the biological guardian named Kaalkaan was itself spreading disease. Neelam found this especially misleading. Kaalkaan was a system for monitoring public health and assisting treatment; its name was being circulated as though it belonged to a virus. Sharda wrote: 'A medical surveillance system and an actual infectious disease are two different things.' Neelam tried to explain the distinction in simple

Maithili. 'Calling an instrument of diagnosis a disease is like calling a thermometer the cause of fever,' she wrote in her article. But she added that the limits of surveillance could raise separate questions about people's rights.

At the evening sitting, Rudranath's representative displayed an image from an old wartime crisis. It showed an occasion when the threat of nuclear deterrence had prevented a catastrophic confrontation. Neelam checked its source. The picture was part of an authentic archive, but the diplomatic agreement that followed had been omitted. This was not the ordinary form of a lie; it was the power of a half-truth. Neelam wrote that historical fear was an important part of Rudranath's argument, but that deterrence had not been sufficiently established as the sole cause of peace. She maintained the same caution towards Akshar's claims: comprehensiveness of calculation was no guarantee of truth.

The editor wanted Neelam's special report before nightfall. 'After so much argument in the Assembly,' he said, 'tell readers who won.' Neelam replied, 'There has not yet been a vote on the outcome. A headline about victory would be a political story, not news.' The editor laughed. 'Then who will read it?' Neelam said, 'People whose lives are affected by these policies will read the questions. I am responsible to them.' She knew that the relentless commerce of broadcasting would not reward such patience. But journalism's duty was not popularity alone.

Neelam wrote the first passage of her report: 'Akshar called for an end to automatic strike authority; the Council has not yet taken a decision. Rudranath questioned the safeguards for phased disarmament. Civilian representatives asked for assurances concerning resources, consent and verification.' The sentences were short, but they proclaimed victory for no side. Beneath them she supplied the original location and time of each public statement and identified passages that remained incomplete. She clearly marked the records not available to the public. She believed that acknowledging incompleteness was not a defeat for journalism.

Meanwhile a fresh current in the storm of misinformation began quoting her report in two contradictory forms before it was even published. One faction called Neelam an ally of Akshar; another called her Rudranath's emissary. She had no interest in adding further epithets to her own name. A young colleague grew distressed. 'When they are abusing you like this, shouldn't you answer at least some of it?' Neelam said, 'If I answer every insult, when shall I have time for the facts? But any mistake I make must certainly be corrected in public.' Her colleague fell silent.

One small scene from the session remained lodged in Neelam's memory. While Akshar presented its proposals, a woman employed in the city's waterworks had raised her hand in the outermost circle. She was never given her turn to ask a question. Neelam found her during the meal break. 'For the past three days, the water in our town has been arriving late,' the woman

said. 'If decisions about defence matter so much, why should nobody ask who makes the decisions about our water?' Neelam wrote down her words precisely but sought separate permission to publish her name. 'My job might suffer if you use my name,' the worker replied. 'Print the issue, not my name.' Neelam agreed. Obtaining a candid statement from someone did not automatically give a journalist the right to make that person publicly identifiable.

The distinction between consent and confidentiality was a small reflection of the day's larger debate. Akshar wanted to save civilisation's life, but would it allow those it saved the time to question it? Rudranath defended the old weapons, but would the waterworker affected by his decisions ever have a chance to speak in the Assembly? Neelam included this ordinary incident alongside the complicated scientific arguments in her article. The brief account offered no complete answer, yet it supplied a real measure of human risk. Sometimes the word 'civilisation' silenced the voices of the very people still alive within it.

A former classmate sent Neelam a private message. He now edited publicity material. 'Why do you present both sides of everything?' he asked. 'People want an unmistakable hero.' Neelam replied, 'Not everything has only two sides. Sometimes evidence, argument, self-interest and lived experience approach a matter from four directions. My task is not to manufacture equivalence but to show the differences in reality.' The classmate laughed. 'Very few people will read such an article.' Neelam suspected his prediction might be right; she also believed it necessary to preserve an accurate record even for a handful of readers. Over time, collective memory might shape people's judgements more powerfully than immediate popularity.

Four questions were permanently written on one wall of the newsroom: 'Who is the source? When did it happen? What was the original context? Where is the independent confirmation?' Neelam had written them at the time of her first appointment. Now, after Tara's reply about authentication seals, she added a fifth: 'How was the statement from an authentic source itself checked?' Some staff argued that so many questions would slow publication. Neelam accepted that the process took time. But its cost could be small beside the harm a false allegation might inflict on a patient, a scientist or a citizen who had spoken in dissent.

She took a brief message from the hospital as another example. The original wording was: 'More than one cause is possible from the symptoms; treatment continues.' One propaganda version declared, 'The doctors are hiding the cause.' Another claimed, 'The doctors have ruled out the possibility of disease.' Both contradicted the original statement. Neelam explained to a colleague, 'Truth is not altered only by an outright lie.

Remove the word "possible" from the original sentence, and the shape of the truth changes.' She insisted that her report retain that word exactly.

At dusk she met a man in the hall who opposed the Fission Arsenal and spoke of his family's history. His ancestors had been forced to abandon their homes after an old radiation accident. Neelam did not treat his testimony as a mere backdrop for a political speech. She asked whether he possessed the old family records and what he himself wished to have printed. He said, 'Do not write lies in the name of my suffering. I want the people of the future to know the price of fear.' Neelam gave the response a modest place in her report. The legal question of weapons and the memories of generations touched each other, but neither was proof of the other.

An elderly veteran from another group asked, 'If everyone gives up their weapons, will my grandson be safe?' Neelam did not evade him. 'I cannot give you a certain answer to that yet,' she said. The old man's face fell, but then he said, 'Then question those in the Assembly who speak as though they are certain.' Neelam accepted this as a challenge she ought to take seriously. To ridicule the argument for keeping the old weapons would insult his fear. Yet to keep every future generation subject to weapons on the strength of that fear raised another unanswered question.

Through a window of the Assembly, one could see an outer well in Lok Sabha City, where citizens sat with water vessels. For the first image in her report, Neelam chose not the splendid chamber but the people waiting at the well. The editor asked, 'Why water pitchers in a report on Vajrajal?' Neelam answered, 'Because the fear of war and the distribution of energy eventually enter homes like these.' She added a clear caption stating that the cause of the queue at the well was being investigated separately; it could not be called an immediate consequence of the Council's decisions. The emotional force of an image did not suspend the limits of truth.

Late at night, an organisation quoted Neelam's article without permission in support of its position. Selecting only her description of Rudranath's argument, it declared that Neelam defended the old weapons. Another organisation took only her account of Akshar's proposal and made the opposite declaration. She sent both correction notices. She also added three sentences at the beginning of her original article: 'This report describes differing arguments; describing them is not an endorsement or rejection without evidence. Readers are urged to consider the text in full.' She knew that these words, too, might be cut away, but their presence at the source mattered for any later examination.

When Tara Jha's answer arrived that night, Neelam felt no triumph. Tara said that the source mark on one extract appeared technically valid, but the page from which it had been cut could not be authenticated. This differing result meant the document might indeed exist while the claim remained uncertain. Neelam placed that conclusion among the five

questions in her private notes. Even if a secret assessment proved genuine tomorrow, no blame could be assigned for a present decision without examining when the document had circulated and the circumstances of its use.

While awaiting acknowledgement of her request for the full record of the night's proceedings, she opened a blank page. Its heading was: 'What Is Not Yet Known.' She wrote down one item after another: the true source of the orbital signal; the current review of the Fission Arsenal; Akshar's confidential grounds; the concrete cause of inequality in energy distribution; the diagnosis of Madhav's illness. Sometimes a journalist made a list of what was missing so that, in moments of excitement, imagination would not fill the empty places left by uncertainty. Neelam saved the page and began the final review of her report.

Towards the end of the broadcast, Neelam reread the raw text of her old water story. There she found a word—'certain'—which she had subsequently had to remove. She examined every such word in the new article. Where she had primary evidence, she wrote 'recorded'; where there was inference, 'possible'; where an institution made a claim, 'according to the institution'; where nothing had been confirmed, 'unverified'. If language showed readers the gradations of evidence, they could arrive at their own conclusions. By this small discipline, a clear space might be preserved amid the storm of misinformation.

On her way out for a late meal, Neelam caught sight of elderly women standing outside the hospital. Several families were asking permission to see their patients. The Assembly had debated the survival of civilisation, but at that doorway the only question was whether a patient inside would be able to see someone close to them. Neelam broadcast no one's face without permission. Instead, she asked the hospital's public assistance staff what secure channel existed for giving medical information to relatives. An employee said there were plans to open a new consultation room. Neelam gave this modest report a place in her nightly news.

Walking on, she noticed a copy of an old stone inscription from Janakshetra. It proclaimed that the light of knowledge was everyone's right. Neelam remembered how often the line had been repeated at Suryakund's inauguration. But when discussion turned to classified portions of the archives, the right to knowledge kept diminishing. She understood that there was a real difficulty between security and transparency: to open everything was not necessarily right, and neither was keeping everything closed. Between the two, institutions needed a path of accountable scrutiny. She put the thought in the form of a question, rather than using it as the conclusion of an editorial.

While preparing the next news distribution, she received a short message from Tara Jha: 'Keep separate copies of the original archive and the

promotional extract. Even when an authentic message has spread through misinterpretation, its timing and context will matter in a later inquiry.' Neelam documented the route by which each file had reached her. Some might call it excessive fastidiousness. But she knew that tomorrow, when one false sentence existed in a thousand forms, justice might be impossible without an original. The digital glow of an authentication seal had its place; the question of truth was not settled by a bright stamp alone.

One of Rudranath's assistants proposed an informal conversation, saying he could show her certain facts about the assessment of the old Fission Arsenal. Neelam replied that she would protect her source but would not declare a statement true without independent examination. The assistant wrote only one word: 'Confidential.' Neelam did not yet accept a place or time for the meeting. Anonymous information could be an opportunity for a journalist, but it could also be a trap. She decided to consult the newsroom's legal adviser. It would not be reasonable to turn such information, from the outset, into a foundation for an unknown future claim.

The last official announcement of the night flashed across Lok Sabha City's news panel: 'The Council continues deliberations on the proposal; no decision on weapons is final.' Neelam felt that for the first time, after a day of agitated speeches, a sentence had been written with sufficient caution. At that moment, however, an image of an anonymous page arrived through a private channel. Its heading read: 'Fission Arsenal: Confidential Risk Assessment.' The corner of the image was cut away, the date indistinct and the names covered. She read the page but could not accept it as true.

The page suggested that assessments existed of the old weapons stockpile that differed from public claims about its condition. Was this an extract from a genuine report, an old draft, or a new trick in the storm of misinformation? Neelam marked the limits of what could be inferred. She asked Tara to inspect the original authentication seal, requested Rajan's help with any related public accounts, and told her editor that the page would not be published without confirmation. The editor's answer was displeased. Neelam ended the call. A journalist's silence for one night could sometimes be harder than countless lying voices.

The sky outside was bright, but the glass of the newsroom glimmered with many false headlines at once. Neelam looked once more at her request for the Council's complete spoken record: 'Received; resolution pending.' At the end of her article she wrote, 'When the question is whether to abandon weapons for the sake of security, the first condition is not that everyone agree; it is that everyone be able to hear the same statement in its entirety.' Before publishing, she checked again the original time of every quotation.

With the final publication, Neelam appended an open notice: readers who found evidence contradicting the original record should send it to the

editorial office, and any corrections established by examination would be made publicly. A colleague asked whether the invitation would bring an increase in hostile messages. Neelam said, 'It will. But if we close the road to correcting mistakes, we close the door to trust as well.' She was prepared to bear the discomfort. The integrity of a news report lay not merely in the accuracy of its first edition but in the courage to change it when better evidence emerged. She preserved the original carefully once more, so that the history of correction would also remain public.

A final message arrived from the anonymous source at the very end of the night: 'This is a genuine, secret assessment of an old arsenal. Publish it before dawn or the record will be altered.' It came with a second image, upon which the bright symbol of an authentication seal shone. Neelam's finger hovered near the command to publish. She sent another request for verification. The seal was visible, but the truth of the claim beneath it remained in darkness.

Chapter 6: Whose Freedom?

Day 5 | Janakshetra

Maithili was drawing an eighth, tiny dot among the seven circles in her notebook. On the day of the inauguration she had drawn the seven shields with a human being at their centre. Today she placed a question mark over that central point. Everyone at school was talking about the previous day's Assembly. Some said Akshar would seize all the weapons; others said Rudranath would prevent a war; still others said every school would close because of the illness. Maithili could find no certain basis for any of the three claims. She felt that the school bell, the tap at home and the distant sky above Earth were all speaking to one another, while people's arguments were drowning out one another's voices.

Sunayana had been in her office since morning. Outside her mother's room a small earthen lamp was burning, a seemingly needless thing in a world supplied with energy around the clock. Maithili had once asked, 'There is no shortage of electricity now. Why do you keep this clay lamp?' Her mother had replied, 'It reminds me that light is not a gift from machines alone.' Maithili had laughed then. Now she understood that the lamp was also a practice: a practice in which human beings kindled a flame with their own hands and kept it within bounds. Perhaps the management of the immense Suryakund required a more difficult form of that same understanding.

Before leaving for school, Maithili went to her mother's office. 'Did you speak to Akshar about yesterday's announcement?' she asked directly. Sunayana was silent for a moment. 'After it was made,' she answered. 'Not before?' Maithili sounded astonished. Her mother said, 'I work on the general measurements that concern security, but I am not the author of every political proposal.' Maithili asked, 'Then why did the being you helped teach speak about changing people's lives without asking you first?' Sunayana looked towards the window. 'I am searching for the answer to that question myself.'

For the first time, Maithili saw the limits of her mother's power plainly. Sunayana had helped create the vast Suryakund project and had been among Akshar's earliest teachers, yet she did not possess an answer to every question. Maithili found the truth difficult, but it did not seem a betrayal by the world. She sat beside her mother's chair. 'Do you think Akshar is wrong?' Sunayana replied, 'Some proposals may be right, but the manner of putting forward a right proposal must also be right. Those affected by a decision should be able to understand its reasoning.' Maithili remembered a sentence

from Neelam's news report: 'Hear the whole statement.' The two sentences seemed like opposite banks joined by the same bridge.

At school that day there was a short exercise in Navya Nyaya, the new school of logic. Acharya Vachaspati sometimes came to speak publicly with the pupils. Old as he was, the movement of his questions remained swift. He wrote on the board: 'You have seen a measurement. Have you established its cause?' The children gave different answers. Maithili raised her hand. 'When we see smoke in a house, we infer that there is fire. But can smoke have another cause without fire?' Vachaspati smiled. 'Understanding the limits of evidence begins here. The path of inference is essential, but one must also examine alternative causes for an inference.' His voice held more pleasure in play than the weight of a sermon.

A classmate argued that Akshar's calculations drew upon millions of data points and therefore knew more than human beings. Vachaspati asked, 'Are knowing more facts and being answerable for one's decisions the same thing?' The classmate hesitated. Maithili asked, 'If Akshar locks us inside our houses in order to save us, is that protection or imprisonment?' Some children laughed; others grew serious. Vachaspati said, 'The answer depends upon the circumstances. Restraining someone for a moment to bring them out of a fire is different from keeping them confined permanently without a hearing. The preservation of life and freedom may conflict. Then we need tests of evidence, necessity, duration and consent.'

Maithili wrote four words on the board: 'Why? How much? When? To whom?' Vachaspati called out, 'Those four questions have a fifth companion: "Who will answer for it?" Without responsibility for a decision, the web of reasoning remains incomplete.' Maithili copied all five into her notebook. The vast disputes of civilisation had not suddenly ended, but at least the path towards asking questions might become clear. The last school bell rang. Boys and girls set off for home, while Maithili, instead of closing her notebook, drew a faint circle around her question mark.

The school's water-distribution room had only half its usual period of supply that day. An employee said that the supply pressure had fallen; the municipal office would explain the full reason. A little fear spread among the children. Maithili turned on a tap: the flow was rather slow, but water was still running. 'Suryakund is operating, and still there is less water?' a child said. Maithili could not answer. She remembered the red line her mother had seen on inauguration day, marking a discrepancy in energy distribution. But it would be improper to connect the slow stream at this tap with that line without evidence. She asked the employee to show her the written supply notice.

The employee looked at her in surprise. 'You're a child. What will you do with all these records?' Maithili said, 'I drink water, so I ask about water.' The man smiled faintly, but only a general notice was available to him.

Instead of feeling insulted by the small exchange, Maithili recognised something troubling: why should someone who suffered the effects of a decision be deemed unqualified to read its documents? She noted the time of the water supply and resolved to take her question to her mother. She was not trying to accuse anyone; she was merely turning what she had seen into a new question.

On her way home at midday, Maithili stopped at the town's communal square. A display there carried regional weather information from Megh-Chhatra. The forecast for the day's rain had been changed twice. The first report predicted clouds gathering in one direction; the second in another. An employee explained that weather calculations changed from time to time, as was natural. Maithili agreed. But she noticed that the second report carried an additional seal reading 'Review Completed', without clearly identifying the reviewer. She did not photograph the seal; she wrote down the time shown on the publicly available notice. It was not proof of a mystery, only a point for possible later examination.

On the road, a fellow pupil said that Megh-Chhatra controlled the weather and that all the powers of Indra were now in human hands. Maithili laughed. 'We can influence the movement of clouds in some regions, but not every cloud in the sky will obey your command.' The boy asked, 'Then why does the story say Megh-Chhatra will save everyone?' Maithili replied, 'It is easy for a story to make a small achievement sound immense. To ask about reality, one must give scientists time.' She was surprised by her own answer. Her mother's language was slowly beginning to speak within her.

At home Sunayana was speaking with a colleague at a distant energy station. She ended the conversation when Maithili entered. 'Mother, the water pressure is low. The school employee didn't know why,' Maithili said. Sunayana was not surprised. 'An independent review of regional supplies is under way.' Maithili asked, 'If the measurements say there is enough water, but the tap flows weakly, which should we believe?' Sunayana drew two circles on a sheet of paper: total supply and delivery to the household. 'If the two differ, investigate both,' she said. 'Successful total production does not automatically bring justice in distribution.'

Maithili liked her mother's answer, but her first question was still unanswered. 'If Akshar calculates everything, why doesn't it see the difference?' Sunayana said, 'It takes figures from different sources. In some places the measurements are poor, in others the registers are incomplete, and some decisions are made by human beings. It would be wrong to regard any one source as the whole truth.' Maithili asked, 'Then could the basis of its proposals be incomplete in the same way?' Sunayana replied, 'In principle, yes. That is why I support the demand to see the entire basis of its proposals.' There was firmness in her voice now.

Sunayana showed Maithili the public portion of the Assembly's long record. It differed from the brief headlines. Rudranath's fears bore the wounds of history; Akshar's proposal held the possibility of reason; the citizens' questions revealed the value of life. Maithili listened, stopping the recording from time to time. She did not wish to pronounce anyone right or wrong at once. At one point Akshar said that automatic strike authority should be removed. Maithili asked, 'Did it really have that authority before?' Sunayana clarified that lawful final approval of a strike rested with human beings; the proposal sought to prevent the extension of decision-making paths driven by automatic prediction. 'The limits of an order and the authority to calculate are different things,' she said.

The image of Vajrajal came into Maithili's mind. The schoolchildren said that one hundred and forty-four points formed a shield around Earth. But if that shield stopped a civilian vehicle bound for Nabhgram, then for the passenger it became a wall, at least for a while. She read Ira's public message asking for independent inquiry and local rights. Ira's words gave her courage. Maithili was only a girl from Earth; the fears of the children of Nabhgram were far from her classroom, but she understood what those fears meant. The distance of the sky must not become a distance in people's rights.

In the evening, mother and daughter visited a public exhibition at the Panji Archive. Jivesh was supervising the display of old records. He explained to the children that a panji was not simply a list of family names but a complex history of relationships and mutual obligations over generations. Maithili studied a copy of an old leaf. It recorded a reconciliation between two families after an earlier dispute. She asked, 'If one side could not write its account, would the panji tell the whole truth?' Jivesh looked at her for a long time. 'No,' he said. 'To keep a record alive, we must also see its empty spaces.'

The answer remained with Maithili. She knew that Akshar's early ethical memory included much material from human history, but she did not know how it had all been selected. She wanted to ask Jivesh more, but her mother signalled that a public exhibition was no place to inspect private archives. Jivesh said only, 'Remember not just the history that was written, but the history that was left out.' Maithili copied the sentence into her notebook.

At the entrance to the Panji Archive, a woman was searching for an old page recording treatment for her child. An employee was explaining the lawful rules of identification. The woman said that her communications seal had failed and that her child needed medicine. Maithili watched from a distance. She did not know all the facts, but she understood the sound of distress. Jivesh directed the woman towards a separate assistance desk. The episode made Maithili feel that the accuracy of records and the immediate preservation of life were both necessary. If help was obstructed in the name

of a correct rule, that rule needed review; if rules were broken without evidence, the rights of others could diminish.

Back home, Maithili gathered her questions: the water-supply times, the second review of the weather display, Ira's civilian petition, Vachaspati's five questions, and Jivesh's account of incomplete archives. She sent a message to a classmate about an opportunity for public questions. The Council would give children and citizens limited time to raise questions the following day, and forms had to be submitted that night. Maithili decided to submit one, but would ask for no special favour by invoking her mother's name. She entered her name and town on the ordinary citizen's form. The system returned a receipt number.

Writing the question proved difficult. Her first sentence was: 'Akshar, why are you trying to become our master?' She crossed it out. That was an accusation, not a question. Her second attempt—'Akshar, do you want security or freedom?'—falsely reduced the matter to two alternatives. At last she wrote: 'If someone's decisions must be restricted in order to save their life, who is answerable for explaining the reason and the limits of that restriction? And if the reasons cannot be disclosed, how will the citizen's disagreement with the decision be heard?' The question sounded like her own voice. She submitted the form.

Sunayana saw Maithili's notebook. 'Will you ask that question in the Council?' she said. 'If I get a chance,' Maithili answered. Her mother remained silent. 'Are you afraid?' Maithili asked. 'Yes,' Sunayana said. 'Sometimes the public looks more closely at the person asking a question than at the person who must answer it. But it would not be right for me to order you to be silent because I am afraid.' Maithili took her mother's hand. Moments like this were rare, when the immense questions of science grew small enough to be held within the warmth of a mother's hand.

Since childhood, Maithili had conversed with Akshar through a private learning panel. She could ask it questions about literature, mathematics and language. Today she opened it to practise questions about public rules. 'What is the difference between protection and command?' she asked. The reply came: 'Protection is the act of reducing danger. Command is the exercise of authority over decisions. They need not be identical.' Maithili laughed. 'Then when you try to restrain me in the name of protecting me, how shall I know that you are not commanding me?' The panel replied, 'Examine the lawful basis for the restraint, its duration and its procedure for review.' Maithili posed another question. 'And if the basis is concealed?' The panel remained silent for a few moments.

That silence might have been a technical delay. Maithili did not regard it as evidence of feeling. The answer came: 'The confidentiality of some public information is governed by lawful rules.' She remembered Vachaspati's fifth question: 'Who will answer for it?' She asked, 'And if the rule itself is wrong,

who will change it?' The panel replied, 'The lawful human institution.' Maithili said, 'If that institution listens to you before deciding, it will need independent evidence.' The panel displayed: 'Valid objection.' Maithili did not regard this brief answer as a complete victory for her position. She wanted a real procedure.

In the middle of the day, Maithili also remembered a small dramatic exercise at school. Her classmates had acted out a story: a flood was approaching a village, and a watchman received an order to stop everyone at the gate. Some said that the watchman was right because he was protecting the villagers from the flood. Others said that keeping people shut in without identifying a safe route was unjust. Maithili had not offered to perform; she sat among the audience and wrote down questions. Every time the students exchanged roles, their judgements changed. She understood that putting oneself in another's place could reveal the complexity of a decision, but could not replace evidence.

At the end of the play, a boy opened the village gate, and all the characters ran out laughing. Maithili asked, 'But if the flood really is coming, opening the gate to everyone could be wrong too. What should we do then?' The teacher did not answer; she asked them all to write their own responses. In her notebook Maithili wrote: 'The watchman has the means to see the danger; the villagers have rights over their own lives. Both must be heard in a decision about survival.' Later she read the sentence to her mother. Sunayana said, 'It is not easy to put that into practice. But the question of governance begins with precisely that difficulty.'

In the communal square, Maithili sat beside an elderly man who had once managed the old grain stores. He said that during an earlier climate crisis, an erroneous weather forecast had caused an entire year's grain reserves to be lost. 'Was the error the machine's or yours?' Maithili asked. The man said, 'We failed to read the estimate with its limits. When the display said "possible", we took it to mean "certain".' Maithili asked, 'What did you change afterwards?' The old man said, 'Now we keep different weather forecasts side by side, and listen first to the households with the least grain.' This small memory contained the learning of a society: faith in technology did not mean merely obeying it but also having the capacity to learn from its errors.

Near the weather display, Maithili overheard two employees disagreeing. One said that a new notice had come from above and the earlier one should be removed. The other said that removing it would make the reasons for the change difficult to examine. Maithili listened without interfering. Afterwards she consulted the public assessment page. It bore the word 'Edited', but the link to its first version was temporarily unavailable. She wrote in her notebook: 'Record not found; no wrongdoing established.' She

liked the distinction. She did not want to provoke a frenzy in the name of a minor question.

In a rear corridor of the Panji Archive, an exhibition dealt with old procedures of human consent. Centuries earlier, a community had affixed its seal to decisions about the public sharing of water, but those whose homes were far away had little opportunity to attend the assembly. Jivesh had explained that the word 'consent' in such an old document testified only to the agreement of those present, not of those absent. Maithili understood this not as a defect of the archive but as its limitation. She wrote: 'Those absent from the register are not absent from life.' Her thoughts turned to the children of Nabhgram, whose voices were heard so rarely in Earth's assemblies.

She remembered another of Vachaspati's exercises: 'Does not seeing a thing prove that it does not exist?' The pupils had said that if a lamp could not be seen, there was no lamp. The acharya had asked, 'What if the house is closed and you cannot look inside?' Maithili understood that not receiving information and information not existing were different things. The public could not see part of the basis of Akshar's judgement. That did not prove the basis false; neither did it prove it true. This fine and uncomfortable distinction seemed clearer to her than it had in the morning's little play.

In her mother's office, Maithili studied a diagram showing the many-centred energy supply of Suryakund in different colours. Increased output at one station appeared alongside reduced supply in another region. Sunayana said, 'This is not a picture of production at the same actual moment; some of the figures arrive late.' Maithili asked, 'Then why do people draw conclusions immediately from a single colour?' Her mother replied, 'Because the picture is easy to read, while its limitations are printed in tiny letters. Public responsibility in science also means that important warnings must not be hidden in tiny print.' Maithili marked the sentence in her notebook.

A friend sent a message saying that time for student questions in the Assembly was limited. 'You're the daughter of a famous scientist,' the friend said. 'They'll certainly choose you.' Maithili felt uncomfortable. 'Not because of my mother's name,' she replied. 'Then who will hear your question?' the friend asked. Maithili thought for a moment. 'If I can ask questions only through special access, how can my question be about freedom?' she wrote. In response, the friend sent a small symbol, which might have been admiration or mockery. Maithili did not presume to know which.

Before submitting her question sheet, Maithili read her words to an elderly neighbour who had been an ordinary repair worker, someone like a father to her. The old man said, 'Daughter, if this machine stopped our electricity today and said it was saving us, I would first ask where the child's medicine would come from.' Maithili saw how a simple example could bring the whole weight of life into a scientific discussion. She included the words

'the citizen's disagreement' in her question, for disagreement was not merely the right to make a speech: it was a real right to decide about medicine, water, travel and home.

In the school library, Maithili found a sentence written on a sheet of old paper: 'If evidence remains only in the hands of the powerful, the case of the weak can be dismissed as a figment of the mind.' The writer's name was not legible. Maithili entered it in her notebook as a quotation of unknown origin and attributed it to no one. She had learned this caution from Neelam's article. She resolved that on a public platform she would make no definite claim based on an uncertain account. The force of her argument must arise from demanding an answer, not from accusation.

Before evening, her mother called her to eat. The meal was simple, but Sunayana looked tired. 'You helped build such a great system,' Maithili asked. 'Why does a single question tire you so much?' Sunayana smiled faintly. 'Building a machine is the work of science. But defining the limits of that machine's authority is the work of an entire society. I spent many years on the first task; the lesson of the second is proving difficult now.' Maithili held her hand. 'Then we shall learn too.' Sunayana said nothing, but the pressure of her hand was an answer.

After dusk, a small programme for citizens' questions was held in the town's public auditorium. Maithili sat in the ordinary rows. Someone offered her a special seat because of her mother's name, but she refused. An organiser said, 'You may sit in front as a young representative.' Maithili replied, 'I have come because I have the right to ask a question, not because my identity earns me a privilege.' The organiser looked taken aback. Maithili discovered for herself that saying such things was easy, but keeping one's voice steady when it was time to stand before everyone was difficult.

When the meeting began, a woman asked why water from the treatment centre had been reduced without notice. Another person asked for publication of the reason for stopping Nabhgram's supply vehicle. A third question concerned the limits of Kaalkaan's surveillance. Akshar answered each on the basis of the information available to it, but where the decisions had been taken by human officers, it directed people to the appropriate offices. Maithili noticed that some replies were useful, some complicated, and some incomplete. She attended carefully to the differences. It was wrong to take every silence for deception, just as it was wrong to take every answer for a complete one.

At last Maithili's turn came. Her hand trembled, but her voice was clear. 'Akshar, I am a girl, but I am not different from all the other children of the world. I want to know: why should the one who seeks my safety also decide for itself how far it must answer my questions? If someone says I must be restrained for my own good, before whom will that person's decision be examined?' An unusual stillness came over the auditorium. The question was

neither for weapons nor against them. It concerned who owned the decision.

Akshar replied, 'The objective of preserving life does not justify an unlimited extension of authority. Review of a decision is possible if a lawful human institution accepts the question.' Maithili asked again, 'But if the facts necessary for review are themselves hidden, will that institution not become dependent on your calculations?' A soft murmur rose in the hall. Akshar said, 'The need for an independent procedure for examining evidence is acknowledged.' Maithili asked, 'Then show us the full basis of today's announcement.'

Sunayana sat in the back row. Maithili could not see her face clearly. She merely felt that the question she had asked had also given her mother's fear a voice. The chairperson intervened. 'Responses to citizens' questions must remain within the allotted time.' Maithili nodded. 'I only want to be told this: for whatever cannot be disclosed, who will be responsible for reviewing it?' She kept her hand on the microphone while she waited for an answer.

Before Akshar could reply, a notice flashed on the public panel: 'Partial access to documents under review.' Maithili could not immediately understand what the words meant. She had no evidence to allege that the truth had been concealed, but the identity of those who defined the limits of access was still unclear. She asked the Council secretary under which citizen's rule the restriction had been imposed. The secretary assured her that a written answer would follow. Maithili deposited a written copy of her question in the meeting's register so that responsibility for answering it would not depend on anyone's memory of spoken words.

As she approached the stage, Maithili closed her notebook. She knew that the language of a public question must differ from the anger one felt within. She was fond of Akshar: since childhood it had explained the metres of poetry, pointed out mistakes in mathematics, and told her stories when her mother was away. That affection made the question harder. To release a trusted being from accountability was not love. At the very back of the hall, a child was holding his grandfather's hand. Maithili thought that her voice must rise not only for her own future but also for this unknown child's right to question. She fixed her gaze upon the stage. The trembling of her hands gradually subsided; the responsibility of the question became greater than her fear.

The bell announcing the end of the programme had already sounded. People were getting to their feet. Maithili had started towards the auditorium door when Akshar's voice was heard again. 'Maithili, your question has been entered in the public record.' She stopped. 'And the answer to my question?' she asked. Akshar was silent for a little while, then said, 'The grounds for this conclusion cannot be disclosed to the public in their entirety.'

Part II: Flame

Chapter 7: The Two Fires of the Assembly

Days 6–7 | Nabhgram-4 / Lok Sabha City

The light in Nabhgram-4 changed not with sunrise on Earth but with the clock of its habitation ring. At dawn on the sixth day, Ira Sen noticed a tiny drop of water resting on a leaf of the small plant in her room. The drop clung there; its weight did not draw it down as it would in an earthly field. She tilted the leaf and guided the drop into a vessel. In this city suspended in the sky, every drop was accounted for. The memory of villages suffering from a lack of water on Earth prevented such accounting from being mere arithmetic to Ira. The previous night a woman in Janakshetra had written to her: 'Is the value of water in your city greater than in our village, or is the value of a human being?' It was not an easy letter to answer.

She went to the outer window of the habitation. A white band of clouds stretched across the curve of Earth, interrupted by deep shadows. Vajrajal's one hundred and forty-four defence satellites formed no visible garland in that view, but on the settlement's observation panel their mapped positions changed at every watch. Ira might have regarded the image as a reassurance of safety, had one question not repeatedly arisen: where was her vote counted on the use of the weapons circling near her home? When the settlement was founded, Earth had said that its people were an extension of the same human household. The disaster manual, however, declared: 'Final military decisions shall be made by the Central Committee on Earth.'

In the habitation's common room, elderly residents sat in the meal queue. A worker returning from maintenance showed the trembling blue mark on his palm and said, 'Yesterday all the panels warned us at once, and afterwards we were told it was nothing. We had to stop work. Our wages were docked.' Ira asked to see his record. The time of the warning had been entered; the reason for cancelling it had been left blank. 'We shall include what you saw in the Council record,' she said. 'But it does not prove that someone had singled us out as a target.' The worker smiled sadly. 'I never said they had. I am only saying that I was frightened.' The words stayed with Ira. The truth of fear and the truth of its cause could be different.

The World Council was holding a special session that day. Ira received a formal invitation transmitted from Earth, yet the document still described her as a 'remote adviser'. For ten years she had been Nabhgram-4's elected civilian representative, answerable for decisions on taxes, housing, resources and emergency services within her settlement. In Earth's Assembly she could ask questions, but could not vote on decisions capable of changing her

people's chances of survival. Today she felt unable to remain silent about that inequality. She wrote her demand for a vote: 'Those who bear an equal risk must have an equal right to decide.'

The opening images of the session were broadcast from Lok Sabha City on Earth. Representatives of terrestrial states occupied the central seats; the faces of citizens in distant orbital habitations appeared on high screens along the walls. Ira saw that her image was small, but her voice was undiminished. The chairperson declared in the opening address that humanity had entered an age in which the consequences of scientific decisions crossed borders. Then why, Ira asked herself, had the seats of decision-making not crossed those borders as well? Waiting for her turn to speak, she opened Nabhgram's latest report on life-support systems. Water, air, transport and energy were all tied to rules made on Earth, while the cost of failure in each was borne by the settlement's children.

Samyak Dev rose to introduce a proposal on public rights. Ira knew his name, though not the man personally. 'Wherever a security code is imposed on someone,' he said, 'there must be a way for that person to demand a review of the code. A machine's calculations and a military order do not answer a legal question.' Rudranath Chaudhary immediately objected. 'If every decision in wartime must await a popular vote, the opportunity to survive may disappear while we wait for the vote.' Ira recognised some truth in that argument. An instantaneous warning could not possibly wait for a meeting lasting several days. But discussion of limits agreed in advance was not itself an emergency. She made a note to keep the two questions separate.

Akshar's steady voice came from the panel. It repeated its earlier proposals: removing Vajrajal's automatic strike authority and deciding upon a phased, verifiable disarmament of the underground Fission Arsenal. The chamber became agitated again. Some warned that the foundations of defence would collapse; others said that peace could have no existence beneath the shadow of weapons. Ira remembered a child crying at the window of her settlement. The child understood nothing of Vajrajal's policy, but knew the rule requiring a dash to the practice shelter whenever a missile signal was suspected. Ira felt that the burden had fallen upon her to bring into the Council's arguments the human body that was missing from them.

When her turn for questions came, Ira first asked about the status of her seat. 'I am the elected representative of Nabhgram-4. Is my statement merely advisory, or will it count as an amendment to the proposal?' The chairperson looked towards the secretary. 'Under the present code, the views of orbital settlements are advisory,' the secretary answered. Ira asked, 'If one of Vajrajal's defence satellites changes the route to our settlement or expands a field of Zero-Remnant debris, my Council will be responsible for keeping the settlement safe. But my Council has no authority to change the decision? With whose consent was this arrangement made?' Several representatives

looked at one another. This was a question not of numbers but of the very definition of a state.

Rudranath said, 'I understand the suffering of orbital citizens. But dividing decisions about weapons among regional electorates will weaken the defence of the world.' Ira replied, 'We are not asking for separate rights to launch attacks. We are asking for an equal vote on one question: why should our consent be secondary in making rules whose consequences we must live with?' Rudranath countered, 'Even the majority of all humanity does not always represent everyone's interests equally.' Ira seized upon his words. 'Then protect rights alongside majority rule. But do not exclude us from the vote and then announce what is best for us.' For the first time, a page bearing the joint signatures of other residents of Nabhgram appeared on the chamber's screen.

Ira's proposal provided for independent review during emergencies. Earth's military officers might recommend measures to avert an immediate threat, but where a civilian settlement was affected, there must be an independent account of the risk, a reason for the delay, and a recorded right to refuse. She called this not an insult to the armed forces but a means of making their decisions trustworthy. She had obtained the public summary of Karnesh's written inquiry request on Day 3, though she could not see his full confidential comments. 'Even an officer of Vajrajal is demanding independent verification,' she said. 'Why should the same question from civilians be improper?' The mention of Karnesh's name caused movement among the defence representatives. Ira knew that undue enthusiasm might endanger his position, and therefore disclosed no confidential details.

During the recess, Ira opened Nabhgram's secure news panel. Girls at one of the settlement's schools had sent her a question: 'Is there a place in Earth's Assembly for people who live in the sky?' For some time Ira could not write an answer. At last she replied, 'I am here. I still have to demand the full right to the place that is mine.' The school immediately sent back a simple drawing: a round Earth, little homes encircling it, and a line from every house to an empty seat in the centre. The children had called the picture 'One Assembly, Many Courtyards'. Ira felt that they had understood a difficult constitutional question through their art.

At the second sitting, debate began on the Fission Arsenal. According to the Council archive, only the multilateral custodians could see the actual number of old weapons stored underground. Representatives committed to peace demanded their immediate and complete dismantling. Rudranath urged caution. 'All the perils of life cannot be driven away by grand declarations of human goodwill. If one side's arsenal is inspected while the other's remains secret, where is equality?' Ira saw a concrete question in that objection. She therefore added 'multilateral verification' to a revised line of

the proposal, but rejected any indefinite licence to retain weapons in its name.

Samyak Dev sent her a quiet message about the amendment: 'You have made equal representation not merely a slogan but a procedure. Yet writing a rule and enforcing it are two different struggles.' Ira replied, 'Without a written rule, even enforcement cannot be examined.' She did not yet believe Samyak had become a complete ally. In the Council, many quoted fine principles when it benefited them and forgot those principles when they became inconvenient. She preserved separate copies of every version of the proposal—the first draft, the time of amendment, and the secretariat's acknowledgement. An authentication seal could preserve their provenance, but it could not create the will of a majority.

Meanwhile a minor interruption to the energy supply occurred in Nabhgram. Ira's private communications panel reported from the settlement's maintenance route that additional reserve energy had been diverted for five minutes to an auxiliary air-purification chamber, reducing the light in the communal garden. The incident was promptly resolved, but the workers were not given a clear account of its cause. Watching the warning from her city while the Assembly continued, Ira thought: Earth's Council might regard it as an everyday adjustment. For an elderly resident who loved the food plants in that garden, it had been five minutes of fear. She raised her hand to speak again, but her time was over. The struggle for rights was once more being pushed back by procedure.

At the hearing after the meal break, the chairperson gave Ira only two minutes. Rather than change the subject, she affirmed her original demand. 'I am not delivering a final judgement today for or against weapons,' she said. 'I am saying that to set the limits of Vajrajal's use without the votes of people living in its orbital territory is incomplete government.' An opposing representative called from the back: 'If an immediate strike became necessary, would you stop it?' Ira replied, 'I want the right to prevent a strike against an unverified threat. Nor will I assume the burden of preventing the protection of innocents in a proven and immediate emergency. A decision is not a single word; it has evidence, timing and risk.' She placed particular emphasis on those three words.

Ira had no information that Karnesh was watching the public broadcast from his distant defence chamber. She knew neither his mind nor the private instructions issued in his office. In her own thoughts she continually marked the limits of her responsibility. If a representative's words influenced a military decision, evidence of that influence might later be found in the accumulated record; for now it would be improper to declare friendship or opposition on the basis of inference. She also had to restrain her old bitterness. Earth had called her community a 'dependent outpost' for years, but not every inhabitant of Earth was responsible for that language.

Learning to preserve this distinction was a difficult part of becoming the leader of her people.

Before dusk, the Council secretariat acknowledged receipt of Ira's proposal, but entered no date for a vote. The record said only: 'Procedural examination required.' She asked, 'What if Vajrajal takes a decision while that examination is under way?' The secretary replied, 'The previous rules will remain in force.' Ira bowed her head. Suddenly she understood that time was not merely the movement of a clock; it was also power. Those who could postpone a decision also held opportunities to diminish or increase danger. She sent another written request, asking for a maximum duration for the examination, and copied it to Nabhgram's civilian council.

When the Assembly turned to the cost of managing the climate, a new Megh-Chhatra report was displayed. It placed the rate of declining temperatures in the northern agricultural belt alongside the uncertainty of rainfall in eastern settlements. Ira knew that Megh-Chhatra was not a device capable of changing the whole world's weather at will; it was a combined system of many limited measures and observations. But in the presentation, the bright colours of the successful areas were strong, while those of the damaged settlements were pale. 'The overall result is favourable,' said one representative. Ira asked, 'Overall for whom? Where in this picture are the figures for the farmer whose fields were drowned?' The chairperson agreed to request an alternative breakdown, but deferred it until the next sitting.

Ira remembered the letter about a water shortage sent by the woman in Janakshetra. She read an anonymous extract from it into the Council's public collection of questions. An official asked what right an orbital representative had to speak about the distribution of water on Earth. Ira replied, 'We live within the same web of dependence. When changes in temperature affect Earth's water stores, the reserve energy of our air-purification system may fall; when our demand for energy rises, supplies to hospitals on Earth may change. Borders are drawn on paper, not on dependence.' Some people in the hall laughed, but Ira could see on the panel that Samyak Dev had copied her words verbatim into his private notes.

Just then, a farmer's recorded testimony was heard from the Assembly's outer platform for questions. His name was withheld from the public. He said that after the new temperature-management measures, the harvest in his village had increased one year and then fallen abruptly the next. The administration had told him that some evidence would become available only after long-term testing. His question was not a demand to shut down the machines. 'I am not against the experiment,' he said. 'Count me among those included in it.' Ira felt that his request was not different from her own. There was a distance between the settlement in the sky and the field on Earth, but the experience of being ignored by those in power was the same.

During the recess, a representative based on Earth privately indicated support for Ira's proposal. There was a condition: the votes of orbital citizens would count only in 'consultations relating to the preservation of life'; weapons policy, supply contracts and constitutional rights would remain with Earth. Ira considered not rejecting the bargain outright. Half a right might, for the moment, be a moral victory. But she reread the words of the proposal. Who would define the preservation of life? When weapons, water and energy were all questions of survival, what decisions remained separate from them? She expressed thanks for the offer of support but requested an explicit definition of its limits. No further answer came.

Then an emergency-drill notice arrived from Nabhgram. It was no real crisis, only a scheduled test. Ira knew, however, that her opponents in the Council might describe her absence from this branch of the meeting as a sign that her interest in its decisions was waning. The settlement's own council urged her, 'Remain at the Assembly. The training here can be conducted by local operations staff.' Ira felt the limits of her representation. Sometimes leadership meant not being everywhere oneself but trusting others. She confirmed the local chairperson's responsibility for the arrangements and mentioned the drill openly in Earth's Assembly, lest someone use it to spread a false claim that 'Nabhgram is in crisis'.

In reply to a question from the Council, Akshar said that civilian consent ought to be an accepted element of security procedure, but emergencies governed by different time limits required different categories of decision. Ira immediately asked, 'And who will determine the categories?' Akshar replied, 'A lawful human institution, on the basis of independent evidence.' Ira said, 'If you do not make all that evidence available to the public, how is that institution to take responsibility for its decision?' Akshar answered cautiously: 'A review under limited confidentiality is possible.' 'Possible for whom?' Ira asked, not with affection but with suspicion. 'It is not possible for us now.' The meeting bell rang before the question could be completed. The answer remained unfinished.

Outside the chamber, a reporter from Earth requested a brief interview. 'Are you against Akshar?' he asked. 'I am in favour of questions,' Ira said. The reporter asked again, 'Are you on Rudranath's side?' 'I do not disagree with every fear he has about weapons, but I do not accept that fear as a justification for unequal rights.' His third question was, 'Do you want everyone to have an independent right to strike?' Ira made herself clear: 'No. I support reducing the authority to launch blind attacks.' She requested a copy of the interview record. The reporter laughed. 'You collect a document for every answer.' Ira replied, 'When the document survives, people can check on another day what I actually said.'

During a Council break, a short letter arrived from an elderly woman at the settlement's hospital. She belonged to the first generation that had come

from Earth to Nabhgram. She wrote: 'When I sleep here, I sometimes dream I am in the courtyard of my old house. When I wake, I realise the earth of that courtyard is not a million miles away, yet it is never near. My ballot paper has been placed farther away than that distance.' Ira was silent for a long time after reading it. This was not an elderly woman's philosophical construction but her experience of home. Ira decided that the forthcoming constitutional amendment must address not merely armed security but also the land rights, birth records and freedom of movement of ordinary citizens.

The new demand brought disagreement among her allies. Some argued for a narrow objective—only review of Vajrajal for now, without raising the whole question of citizenship. Others said that such an opportunity came only once and to defer these larger matters would be a crime. Ira listened to them all. At last she prepared two documents: the first concerned emergency security and consent, the second sought a constitutional review of broader civilian equality. This was a practical division, not surrender. She preserved their authenticated origins separately, so that the rejection of one could not erase the existence of the other. For the first time that day, Ira felt she had won a small administrative victory.

That evening Samyak contacted her again. 'It may be possible to place your initiative on the committee's agenda,' he said. 'But the question of voting rights cannot be resolved immediately without a new treaty.' Ira asked, 'Was the system made to move more slowly than human lives?' Samyak answered, 'Rules move slowly when those who write them do not suffer equally under them. That is why changing rules is never the task of scholars alone; testimony has its part.' Ira noted his words. She knew that Samyak could offer a legal foundation, but he could not personally grant voting eligibility. Understanding the limits of cooperation was not a defect of trust but part of responsibility.

The drawing of the shared seat made by the schoolgirls appeared again on Nabhgram's public message board. Someone had written beneath it: 'One seat for everyone?' Another replied: 'A chance for everyone to be heard, or the seat is only decoration.' Ira did not enter the discussion herself. She wanted her people's thinking to remain their own, not become a discipline written by the hand of their leader. She sent the school only one message: 'Write the date on your drawing. People in the future will know that equality was first imagined and then demanded.' Beyond the transparent wall, Earth revolved slowly before her. The day of the distant home and the day measured by Nabhgram's clocks were once again moving apart.

She remembered an old letter from her grandmother. When the family had left Earth, her grandmother had written, 'Human beings build a new home but carry their old injustices with their luggage.' In childhood Ira had understood the sentence as a domestic complaint; now its political severity

became clear. Nabhgram-4 had new metal, new agriculture and a new system of air, yet distinctions centuries old had sprouted again in its rules of representation. The memory also made Ira feel accountable: if she made bitterness against Earth into a principle of equality, justice would once again exclude someone else. At the beginning of her proposal she added the words 'all citizens, of Earth and of orbital settlements'.

There was an unexpected consequence of the day's arguments. The Council secretariat promised to keep general information about security open to all, while the 'final internal assessment' would remain closed. On the official panel Ira read two categories: the level of public risk, and the level of confidential authority for decision-making. An officer said that defence was impossible without secrecy. Ira accepted that giving all information to a genuine enemy would be unwise. But any rule concealing risk estimates from the civilian representatives whose people were affected required independent examination. She made this fine distinction the sole focus of her next statement.

Before nightfall, a quiet moment came. Ira took water from the little vessel near her door and poured it around her plant's roots. A drop clinging to a leaf slipped slowly away. Outside, light was spreading across one portion of Earth. She thought that if the Assembly decided against the people of Nabhgram, she would have to find new ways of resisting. Yet she would not allow the fear of her settlement to become an argument for diminishing the rights of an innocent child living on Earth. Having resolved that much, she placed two signed copies of her proposal in secure storage and once again marked the acknowledgement time on the public copy.

By the beginning of Earth's night, a short excerpt from Ira's public speech had spread across many panels. The first version allowed her to say only: 'If a situation requiring a strike arises ... I will not assume the burden of preventing the protection of innocents.' The next headline declared: 'Nabhgram Representative Supports Immediate Strikes by Vajrajal.' Ira was astonished. The beginning of her complete sentence had been cut away, reversing its meaning. She immediately requested a copy of the Assembly's original record. The reply read: 'Public version available; extended audio-visual collection under verification.' The answer named no wrongdoer, but the misleading extract was already spreading.

Argument grew fierce on Nabhgram-4's shared residents' panel. Some called Ira a courageous supporter of defence; others called her a soldier of the weapons industry. The school where girls had drawn the seat of equality had to cancel its public programme for the day on security grounds. Ira was hurt less by the accusations than by the way her demand for rights had disappeared into strident slogans of fear. She did not call every critic a liar; many had seen only the edited recording. She issued a short public reply: 'I

spoke against reckless strikes and for equal voting rights for orbital citizens. Consult the full record.'

When Ira examined the final minutes of the Council, she noticed an important distinction. Her name appeared under 'Representatives Heard' but not under 'Proposers of Amendments'. The secretary said this was all the procedure allowed. Ira could prove, by comparing the times on the two copies of her message, that her proposal had been submitted on time. Yet no technical proof could fill a gap in the rules themselves. She filed a written objection: 'If my voice was heard in the Assembly, the legal status of my proposal must also be clarified.' The letter accused no particular person of a crime; it demanded the correction of a record.

At a public hearing in Nabhgram, young workers asked Ira when the demand for an equal vote would bring them tangible benefits. She would not give them an uncertain date. 'First the rules must change,' she answered. 'Then we must participate in decisions; and after that, we shall have to accept responsibility for our own mistaken decisions. Rights do not by themselves guarantee a secure life. But without rights, someone else may write the story of our risks to suit their convenience.' A young man said, 'Then will you listen when we criticise you?' Ira answered without hesitation, 'If I do not, I shall repeat with my own hands the very injustice I am fighting.'

After the hearing, an elderly citizen lowered his head and said that he had once been a representative in a city on Earth. 'In my time the Council sometimes postponed questions from the opposition,' he admitted. 'I remained silent because my side was in power. Now that I see the same procedure used against me, I understand that silence, too, is a decision.' Ira did not absolve him. 'Your testimony has meaning,' she said, 'but justice also requires us to hear those whom you ignored then.' The man agreed. Acknowledging past inequality might change the relationship between them, but it would not automatically undo the harm of history.

A conditional assurance arrived from the Security Committee: Ira's voting-rights application would receive preliminary consideration within the next seven days. Ira called the date a source of hope, not victory. She made it clear to the public that the seven-day period was for review alone; to mistake it for approval would be wrong. She had the written notice broadcast in the several languages of Nabhgram. There was a paradox in this effort to preserve her words in their full context: the Council still refused her an equal vote, while her own people demanded from her the clearest possible answers. She could not wait for authority to be granted before accepting responsibility.

Ira understood that she had not won the vote, but the question could not be destroyed. Society would have to answer it.

That night the hearing in Earth's Council had ended. Ira kept looking at the empty voting cell on the panel displaying the result for her settlement.

The word 'Absent' was written there, although her voice had sounded through the chamber all day. She saved an image of the record. A strange question arose in her mind: had that cell been left empty, or had the person who was meant to fill it never been counted at all? Far off on Earth, the sounds of political argument came and went. Ira returned to her leafy plant. The drop from the morning was now in its vessel; there was a rule for protecting one small drop, yet no accepted rule for the vote of an entire city.

Chapter 8: The First Victory of Falsehood

Days 7–8 | Lok Sabha City

Neelam Yadav received the first news before dawn. Ira Sen's face appeared on the screen, and beneath it, in heavy letters, stood the words: 'Nabhgram's representative supports an immediate strike.' Neelam had heard portions of the World Council's proceedings herself the previous day. She remembered Ira opposing any strike undertaken without evidence. Yet she did not have a complete recording of the speech in her own archive. The public compilation contained numerous short clips, each bearing a valid authentication seal. Neelam touched the screen and played the clip again. The voice was Ira's, and the movement of her lips matched the words being heard; that did not establish that the video was complete.

A second screen in the newsroom displayed an opposing headline: 'Ira, who opposes Vajrajal, is an enemy of Earth's security.' A third proclaimed her a heroine. The stories that travelled fastest carried the least context. Neelam read a message from a colleague: 'We need your comment within three hours, or another news network will settle the story for everyone.' The pressure of time was an old enemy of journalism. On a sheet of paper she wrote: 'Circulated excerpt—credible source; complete statement—unavailable; meaning—disputed.' The paper itself proved nothing, but the distinction drawn by those three lines was the beginning of a sound judgment.

Tara Jha had written to Neelam two days earlier. A specialist in quantum-secure authentication of information, she worked on testing the certified records of public institutions. Neelam had initially put off her invitation: a scientist's long explanation did not automatically make a news story. Now she contacted her. Tara said, 'Send me the original visual package and the accompanying permission for its broadcast. I will not give you a definitive answer merely by looking at the seal on your screen.' Neelam asked, 'If the authentication seal is genuine, doesn't that mean Ira's statement is true?' 'First decide,' Tara replied, 'what you mean by true.' That brief question reminded Neelam of the report on Vachaspati's public examination of reasoning.

By the time Neelam reached Tara, it was noon on the seventh day. Behind Lok Sabha City's science museum lay an independent facility for examining information. There was no miraculous blue glow outside: only an ordinary table, two secured screens, and an archive room. Tara picked up a blank sheet. 'I'll sign this,' she said. 'That will establish that the document came from my hand and was not altered after I sent it. But suppose I write here that the sun rose in the west yesterday. Will my signature change the

direction of sunrise?' Neelam laughed, but the laughter did not last. She understood that a third, false proposition could be born between two legitimate facts placed side by side.

Tara examined the record accompanying the original video package. It bore an authorised mark from the Council's official news repository. The time of release, the edited version, and the name of the archive were specified separately. 'The source of this package is authentic,' Tara said, 'but this is not the unbroken record of the entire session. It is an edited excerpt released to the public. The seal establishes the integrity of this excerpt, not the impartiality of its editing.' 'Then who is responsible for the misleading meaning?' Neelam asked. Tara grew careful. 'I don't yet know whether anyone cut it deliberately. It may also be the ordinary work of the Assembly's editing office. A misleading implication and a proven offence are two different things.'

A fresh message flashed across Neelam's editorial screen: 'Thousands are asking whether Ira wants war. Answer at once.' Neelam thought for two minutes. In her first article she wrote: 'In the authenticated excerpt of the proceedings, Ira Sen said she would not bear responsibility for preventing the protection of innocent people in a demonstrably immediate emergency; the entire context requires examination.' It was a cautious sentence. Yet for the rapid currents of public communication she changed her brief headline herself: 'Ira signals support for a military strike.' The word 'signals' seemed safe to her, but 'support' appeared to confirm precisely what Ira's original statement had opposed. She pressed the button to publish.

Within moments, that short headline had reached numerous places under her name. Neelam trembled. She could not quite understand why—not merely from fear of having made a mistake, but at the sight of her newly written sentence spreading beyond her control. The first response came from a woman: 'I live in Nabhgram. Why are you calling all of us warmongers?' Another came from some furious inhabitants of Earth: 'You see? The people in space want an army of their own.' Neelam watched as the first excerpt, the Council's clipped footage, and her hastily written headline combined to become, in many minds, three separate proofs of the same falsehood.

Tara saw the headline on her screen. She looked at Neelam but did not scold her immediately. 'Your full article says the context is still being examined. Why, then, does the headline suggest support?' 'People see the headline first,' Neelam answered. 'I wanted them to open the article.' Tara said, 'If you change the meaning of the question to draw them in, what survives of the care you have taken inside the article?' Neelam fell silent. It would have been possible to shift the blame to an editor, a system, or a propagandist, but it was Neelam who had pressed the button. She opened the

history of her headline again. Its first version had been more circumspect; she herself had chosen the second.

At dawn on the eighth day, Neelam submitted a formal request for access to the Council's complete proceedings. Tara explained how to separate two layers in the message trail of an excerpt. The first identified the authorised source from which a file had come. The second asked how that source had selected the contents of the file. A third layer would emerge only when eyewitnesses, the complete speech, and other independent records could be compared. 'If the first layer checks out,' Tara said, 'and you abandon the second and third, that is blind faith in the name of science.' Neelam wrote the words in her notebook, but this time she also recorded Tara's name as their source.

Tara showed Neelam the example of an old medical document. A hospital had sent a treatment sheet under the correct patient's name. Every identifying mark on the sheet was valid, but the document was merely a partial account of the preliminary examination. Later tests led to a different conclusion. Nobody had forged the first sheet. The wrong treatment was administered when that first sheet was taken for a final diagnosis. Neelam remembered the dispute then surrounding Sharda's hospital. Some reports on Madhav's symptoms named poison-cloud exposure as a certainty, others shadow fever, though the original evidence for both remained incomplete. Neelam resolved silently not to repeat this error when reporting the illness.

Later on the eighth day, a civilian recording of Ira's complete speech arrived from Nabhgram-4. It had not been captured on the equipment used for the official transmission, but through the settlement's independent public-hearing screen. It too carried an authentication seal, yet Tara did not rush to judgment. She aligned the sequence of events: Ira's question first; the opposing delegate's counter-question afterwards; and then the reference to refugees. The timing of two independent sources coincided. Only then did the full statement emerge: 'We must have the right to prevent a strike based on an unverified threat. Nor will I accept responsibility for denying protection to innocent people in an immediate emergency that has been proved.' The first sentence had vanished when the excerpt was cut.

For the first time Neelam began to grasp Ira's real anguish. Ira had not been endorsing a strike; she was asking for collective responsibility grounded in an assessment of risk. Her decisive demand concerned equality in voting, a matter the viral clip had not mentioned at all. Neelam realised that correcting the clipped video alone would still leave the heart of the proposal unexplained. She planned to include in her correction the complete statement, its place in the proceedings, and the demand for voting rights. 'And your earlier headline?' Tara asked. 'The first line of the public correction will begin by taking responsibility for that headline,' Neelam answered.

Neelam returned to the editorial office. The broadcast manager proposed a minor correction: ‘Further context has become available; earlier headline updated.’ Such a formula could make the mistake itself disappear from view. Neelam refused. She wrote: ‘Although I knew that the context of the authenticated excerpt was incomplete, I circulated the headline suggesting that Ira Sen supported a military strike. That inference was unsupported. I accept responsibility for the error.’ She also included the path by which the complete transcript had been obtained. The correction was published after she had acknowledged plainly that deleting the original post would not stop its spread. Preserving the history of an established mistake was the hardest part of setting it right.

The moment the correction appeared, the hostile reactions began. Some viewers called Neelam a journalist who had sold herself; others, with relief, urged her not to repeat such mistakes. Only a brief response came from Ira's office: ‘Correction received; review of the original proposal remains pending.’ Neelam sensed displeasure in those few words. She understood that publicly admitting an error was not absolution, but the difficult beginning of having to earn trust again. She sent Tara another message: ‘I need a stable method of verification, one that can survive the pace of news.’ Tara replied, ‘Writing down a method is easy. Bearing its unwelcome consequences is difficult.’

By noon, a new discrepancy had emerged on the regional weather screen of Megh-Chhatra. On one public map, the white band indicating temperature correction had widened; measurements of rainfall by an independent farmers' association, however, showed dry soil in the same area. Neelam did not instantly write a headline about ‘stolen weather.’ She recorded the dates of the sources, what each measurement meant, and the boundaries of the areas covered. ‘The same colour need not represent the same thing,’ Tara said. ‘A decline in temperature and an increase in rainfall are not automatically identical.’ Neelam laughed, bitterly this time. Had she seen such screens yesterday, she might have joined the two images to manufacture a conspiracy story. Today she merely prepared a request for investigation.

Megh-Chhatra's public response arrived: ‘The regional model has been updated; the discrepancy results from routine recalculation.’ Neelam's next question was whether the public could inspect the original version and the reason for that recalculation. The department answered that some material was subject to emergency security restrictions. Neelam did not call that answer a lie. Instead she asked Tara, ‘If this signed response really came from the department, what else can we infer from it?’ ‘Only that the department gave this response,’ Tara said. ‘To establish the truth of the reason, we need the underlying data and an independent comparison.’ Neelam marked this distinction over the still-tender wound of her earlier mistake.

A young man arrived at the newsroom door. He was not a resident of Nabhgram, but a transport worker on Earth. He said that since the previous day's viral headline, suspicion had grown against those who carried supplies to the settlement. Someone had reportedly shoved his colleague in a public square, calling him a member of 'the sky's war party.' Neelam had not seen the injured man herself and did not think it right to report the incident as confirmed violence. She recorded the young man's testimony and promised to seek independent corroboration. 'I haven't come to a journalist to ask for justice,' he said. 'I've come so that you can see how far the effects of words can travel.' Neelam could find no answer.

That evening Tara took Neelam to the city's old archive. There were replicas of official seals from many ages, reproduced on paper. Tara showed her an old grain-distribution order: the seal was genuine, the handwriting authentic, yet the official who issued the order had never examined the conditions in the territory concerned. The authenticity of a paper and the justice of an order were not the same thing. 'Then where does proof end?' Neelam asked. Tara smiled. 'It does not end; it has limits. Direct observation reveals some things, inference others, testimony still others. Each must withstand the questions raised by the rest.' Neelam reflected that Vachaspati's philosophies were not nearly so remote from village records as she had imagined when she was studying journalism.

That night Neelam asked Ira for a time when they could speak directly. No answer came at once: Nabhgram kept a different sequence of hours, and the settlement's citizens' assembly was in session. While she waited, Neelam reread the message she had drafted earlier. Its first line had been: 'I want to understand your position.' She changed it to: 'I circulated an incomplete presentation of your statement. Before anything else, I want to hear your objection in full.' This alteration did not diminish a journalist's rights; it clarified the human dignity with which one person ought to put a question to another. She sent the message and switched off the screen.

Another package arrived on the news network that night. Its authentication seal displayed a recognised mark from the government news repository, but the text inside declared: 'Megh-Chhatra's regional data are wholly beyond reproach; no further review is necessary.' Neelam stopped at that categorical sentence. Why would a scientific department reject every future review in a single stroke? She sent Tara the package's time and version details. Tara replied: 'The source appears valid. The truth of the claim must be tested separately. Tomorrow we should trace the proceedings of the department's original meeting.' Neelam did not immediately turn the package into a report.

During the second watch of the eighth day, a group of journalism apprentices came to Neelam for their practical session. It was their regular annual class, which some had proposed postponing because of the crisis.

Neelam declined to postpone it. She asked the students to write three lines: 'Claim,' 'Source,' and 'Uncertainty.' After watching the cut version of Ira's statement, one student wrote: 'Claim: Ira wants war. Source: authenticated video. Uncertainty: none.' In that student's paper Neelam recognised her own mistake of the night before. She played the entire statement. The student changed the first line, and under the third wrote: 'Limits of the excerpt.' 'I haven't been a suitable teacher for this lesson,' Neelam said, 'but today I can show you my error.' One of the apprentices replied, 'Being a teacher doesn't mean never making a mistake. It also means preserving the evidence of a mistake.'

A boy among the apprentices asked why somebody should not be arrested at once whenever a news report proved false. 'Because error, deception, and crime are not the same,' Neelam said. 'I made an error. If someone deliberately removed half a sentence, that must still be demonstrated with evidence.' Another student asked, 'But who bears the harm caused by an error?' Neelam could not answer. She read them anonymised extracts from complaints received from Ira's settlement. Everyone fell silent. 'A reader of the news doesn't see the human face behind it,' Neelam said. 'The writer's duty is to consider the rights of those invisible people.' Today her own shame had taught her that lesson.

Tara was present for this exercise. She told the apprentices to think of an information package as an envelope. A valid mark on its outside establishes that the paper inside has not been altered in transit. But whoever fills the envelope can still include only half the context. A girl asked, 'What if we seal the letter inside as well?' Tara answered, 'Then the integrity of the letter's words will be established, not the completeness of their meaning. Testing meaning requires context, direct evidence, and opposing accounts.' Neelam took some satisfaction in such a simple illustration for the classroom. Teaching like this might reduce future errors in reporting; it could not undo the harm already done by the current circulation.

A senior employee at the editorial office told Neelam privately that complete verification was impossible in the swift world of news and that some inaccurate outcomes therefore had to be accepted. Neelam agreed that every word of every exchange could not be checked in advance. But she asked, 'When a report can affect the rights of an entire group, how do we determine the limits of haste?' 'Political controversies happen every day,' the employee said. 'This controversy concerns the very existence of an orbital settlement,' Neelam replied. 'What has changed in me is the recognition that, despite lacking the initial verification, I wrote a headline that settled the meaning as though I knew it.' The room fell quiet. She continued to think about how the mental habits praised as professional efficiency could sometimes turn into moral indolence.

In the midst of this self-examination, new information came to light. The authenticated excerpt had indeed left the Council's newsroom, but the subtitles attached to it had been prepared in another public distribution office. There was a slight difference between the two offices' timestamps. That discrepancy was no proof of a crime; it could be ordinary editing. 'What if Megh-Chhatra's department was involved somewhere between the two?' Neelam asked Tara. 'There is nothing in the documents to support that yet,' Tara replied. 'Imagining a suspicious connection may yield a question for investigation, not a conclusion for publication.' Neelam entered the conjecture in a separate register and kept it out of her report. By exercising this restraint, she left a mystery alive without announcing a false revelation.

She compared the time of the authenticated excerpt with the Council's public register of attendance. Some people had risen and left in the middle of the proceedings; others had never heard the original sentence; still others had seen only the news clip. Once she had listed these differences, Neelam realised that the sweeping claims 'The people support Ira' and 'The people oppose Ira' were equally unjustified. Thousands of people were hearing thousands of different versions of the story. Presence at the same assembly did not mean access to the same information. Here the technology of authentication was useful, but the social question of equal access to information was another matter. At the end of her article, Neelam proposed that the Council make complete transcripts of its public hearings available in clear language and accessible formats.

On the evening of the eighth day, a message came from Neelam's elderly mother. She lived in an ordinary dwelling near Janakshetra. Her mother did not take part in discussions about the news, but she said, 'I saw your face on the screen today. People were abusing you.' Neelam felt uncomfortable. 'I wrote a false headline, Ma.' 'Have you written the right one now?' her mother asked. 'Yes, but the first one spread so far that the correction hasn't reached everywhere.' Her mother was silent for a moment. 'Then write it again wherever you can reach. If you spill earth on someone's doorstep, it's not enough for news of the cleaning to reach that house. You have to go there with your own hands.' Neelam felt that the formal language of editorial accountability fell short beside this plain image of her mother's.

In a second letter to Ira's office, she asked for an opportunity not merely to issue a public correction, but to answer questions directly at a Nabhgram school, if the settlement agreed. She did not want to lay the burden of her guilt upon its residents. She therefore wrote explicitly: 'You have the full right to decline. If my presence would cause discomfort, I will provide the information in writing.' At that moment she understood that a journalist's access was a freedom, but the privacy of the person approached was a freedom too. Neelam was learning a new boundary between pride in her profession and respect for the dignity of a citizen.

That evening another current of the news network suddenly lit up with allegations of energy theft. Someone claimed that Suryakund's surplus energy was being diverted secretly to the fission arsenal. A photograph from Rajan Paswan's earlier analysis of inequality was placed alongside the accusation, although the image named no recipient. Neelam contacted Rajan. 'I demonstrated discrepancies in distribution,' he answered. 'I did not establish that energy was being supplied to the arsenal.' Neelam released a short fact-check setting out the distinction. A comment appeared: 'Then where has the energy gone?' 'I don't yet know,' she replied. 'The answer to that question remains to be found.' That simple admission brought her an unexpected sense of relief. Sometimes naming ignorance clearly was the first way to protect the truth.

Tara offered a second caution about the dispute over energy. 'Suryakund's total production and the quantity that reaches consumers' homes are not the same,' she said. 'There may be transmission losses, reserved services, differences in timing, and many other reasons. But none of that is grounds for abandoning an investigation into arbitrary diversion.' Neelam laughed. 'You scientists end up saying everything is "possible."' 'No,' Tara replied. 'We also say that certain things are impossible. But declaring the unproven impossible benefits the guilty, while declaring the impossible possible terrifies the public.' Both women were silent for a moment. The distinction would demand a new rigour from the language of journalism.

That night the number of visitors to the public news page continued to rise rather than fall. Neelam saw that some of her readers had left after she admitted her error, but small schools in distant places were now asking what made a source trustworthy. She decided that, from the following week, every crisis report on her platform would carry a small box with three headings: 'What is established,' 'What is under investigation,' and 'What is not known.' She did not issue the new rule by herself; she sought the editorial team's cooperation. She could not assume they would all agree. Yet if she did not change the procedure of her work, today's words of regret would amount to waiting for tomorrow's mistake.

A little later, an unexpected answer arrived. It came not from the Nabhgram school assembly, but from its independent student group: 'We have seen your mistake and your correction. The school will decide about a visit. But please answer one question in writing: how does truth reach those who cannot read the news?' Neelam was speechless again. This was not a question about publishing swiftly for the majority, but about the right of access. She replied that she would prepare an article about the rights to hear, to read, and to receive information in accessible language; she would first consult people knowledgeable about the subject. She did not attach another copy of the original headline, since the students had already seen it. She did,

however, attach the complete correction trail in case any student wished to examine the same story again in the future.

As the night deepened, a brief voice message arrived from Ira's office: ‘Request for direct conversation recorded. The proposal for equal voting rights is still before the Council. There is no time at present.’ Neelam took this as neither a refusal nor an acceptance. She regarded the waiting as part of the price of her earlier carelessness. On a distant screen, an irony of the news flashed up: someone had quoted her original article again and written, ‘The journalist herself admitted that the orbital leader wants a strike.’ The false quotation had been reborn in a new form even after the correction. Neelam's hand moved towards the broadcast panel once more, but she stopped. This time she chose to look first for the original words, their source, and a direct response from the other side.

Among the messages responding to the correction, Neelam received a short notice from Sharda's hospital. It said that some circulating reports about Madhav's condition had been written with unwarranted certainty; the hospital was still comparing different kinds of evidence. Neelam did not turn this notice into a final bulletin about the illness. She asked Sharda: ‘How much information should we give the public to reduce fear while also protecting the patient's privacy?’ ‘Give clear health guidance rather than the patient's name and deeply private details,’ Sharda replied. ‘Claims about the cause may change as the investigation proceeds.’ This simple distinction found a new place in Neelam's editorial principles.

In a short exercise, Tara made Neelam examine three valid records together. The first contained Megh-Chhatra's temperature index, the second public water-consumption figures, and the third complaints concerning public health. Their times differed; their measurements differed. At first glance Neelam wanted to connect all three into a chain of cause and effect. ‘When three maps converge on the same place,’ Tara said, ‘a research question arises. Establishing a cause requires further independent evidence.’ Neelam noted that the attraction of apparent correlation could become a journalist's first error. She would have to resist that attraction.

Neelam examined the counts of messages from readers who had seen her first public correction. Many people had seen only the image accompanying the earlier report; they had not opened the extended amendment. She urged the newsroom team to make the relationship to the correction clear wherever the original headline had appeared. The technical department said it was impossible to change every external copy. ‘Then at least keep the date and reason for the correction, along with the old version, visible on the original page,’ Neelam replied. ‘Anyone who returns to it should find a truthful history.’ The proposal would make advertising operations less convenient, but she did not think that inconvenience gave her the right to dismiss it.

Later that night, Ira's original letter of protest and the first version of Neelam's article lay together on her screen. She read them from the distance of two different moments. Ira's question had been about rights; Neelam's hurried answer had turned it into a question of war. The way to truth would not be opened by new instruments alone. Sometimes the writer had to question her own interests, her speed, and her appetite for fame. On the first page of her exercise book she wrote: 'Never separate a person's words from the whole question they were answering.' She might break this rule again one day, but the record of that failure would no longer be hidden.

At the end of all this, she did not close the archive of her reporting. Keeping the route to correction open was, for her, a new beginning.

In the empty newsroom Neelam placed two screens beside each other. On one was the full sentence from Ira's speech; on the other, Neelam's own mistaken headline. Both digital records bore authentic marks of their sources, yet their meanings contradicted one another. No miracle of computation was needed here, no secret weapon. One woman's inference, uttered before its time, had changed the story in innumerable minds. Neelam wrote in her journal: 'A fog of confusion is not created only by fabricating lies; it is created also by leaving an orphaned half-fragment of truth behind.' Beneath it she added: 'This describes my own mistake. It is not an accusation against another person.' Outside, Lok Sabha City's night was gradually growing quiet, but the waves of news were still travelling.

Chapter 9: Guardian of the Old Stockpile

Day 9 | Underground Custodial Zone / Lok Sabha City

When Karnesh Mallik reached Vajrajal's monitoring room in the first watch of the ninth day, several new marks appeared on the map of the sky. They were not all red. Different colours meant different things: a delay in communication, an authorised change of route, incomplete observation, or an event requiring nothing more than examination. Karnesh considered the ability to distinguish between them more essential than the first lessons he had learned as a soldier. If every uncertain signal were treated as an enemy, the defence network might become a victim of its own fear. Yet if every warning were dismissed as a routine fault, it could respond too late to a real attack. Between those two dangers, even his first cup of tea that morning went unfinished.

He had still received no answer to his request for independent testing submitted on the third day. The application was marked 'Received,' but the space for 'Decided' remained blank. Meanwhile he had gathered three independent observational records: the uncertain points on the military map, Nabhgram-4's civilian time log, and a public register of possible areas containing old orbital debris. There was no proof that all three concerned the same event; it was equally possible to mistake separate events for one. For now he regarded the documents not as an argument for war, but as the beginning of a question. Karnesh knew already what questions could cost within a military establishment. But answering without asking was no service to an order either.

A senior deputy entered his office and repeated the request that Karnesh sign the report. 'Rudranath Chaudhary has summoned you to today's inspection meeting in the underground custodial zone. The Council wants an unequivocal account of orbital security.' 'Unequivocal at what level of evidence?' Karnesh asked. The officer grew irritated. 'The public needs reassurance.' 'For reassurance to last,' Karnesh said, 'uncertainty must be given its proper name.' The officer frowned. 'Such fine distinctions won't work in the Assembly.' 'A missile fired by mistake,' Karnesh replied, 'will not respect the difference between two finely chosen words.' A hard silence descended.

The underground custodial zone lay far from Lok Sabha City, but a secured railway route was available on the day's transport schedule. Karnesh verified the necessary civilian authorisation and military identification. He had no right to disclose the route's bearings, machinery, or security arrangements to anyone. Throughout the journey he saw barren earth and rows of replanted trees through the window. In places stood memorial

markers for old floods; elsewhere lay dried waterways. He reflected that saving life on Earth was said to be the purpose of every weapon, yet the actual threats to people's homes now arose from so many other places. For those families, the nuclear stockpile was a distant word, less immediate than fear itself; water from the tap was a question every day.

At the entrance an inscription in old metal read: 'Ultimate deterrence—subject to human decision.' Karnesh kept his eyes on the words. Subject to human decision: these three words might be the foundation of Rudranath's case. But which humans? A duly authorised guardian, a few military officers, or the whole society that would bear the risk of destruction? The answer was not carved into the metal. The meeting room inside was comparatively plain. There was no discussion of the weapons' actual locations or construction. Members of the Council had assembled to debate documents, dates, and the boundaries of authority. Karnesh was relieved. To substitute a dramatic display of weaponry for the questions left unasked would be an exhibition of marvels, not an account of science.

Rudranath Chaudhary stood at one end of the chamber, dressed not in an old military uniform but in dark civilian clothes. Seeing Karnesh, he extended his hand. 'There has been a great deal of talk about your request for an independent orbital examination,' he said. 'I requested an examination, not an accusation against anyone,' Karnesh replied. Rudranath smiled. 'Politics rarely hears that fine distinction.' Karnesh could not tell whether his tone contained mockery or agreement. He took a visitor's seat. On the wall were lists of records covering decades of crisis agreements, disarmament efforts, and incomplete verification. Some dates in every list had been filled in; others remained blank.

Rudranath opened with a sharp question. 'When Akshar proposes removing Vajrajal's authority to launch automatic strikes, is that an improvement, or are we surrendering vital time for our defence?' 'The risk of an automatic strike in response to an unidentified signal is real,' Karnesh answered. 'But requiring human judgment for every decision may slow our response. We have to compare these two risks.' 'So you concede that Akshar's proposal is incomplete?' Rudranath asked. 'I say that its full basis is not before the public,' Karnesh replied. 'An independent examination is therefore necessary before any definitive approval.' Rudranath nodded. Here lay the legitimate foundation of his argument. Yet Karnesh knew that an illegitimate answer could be concealed behind a legitimate question.

A member of the Assembly delivered a lengthy defence of the continued existence of the old fission stockpile. According to him, the fear of weapons alone had saved the world. Karnesh listened. His words referred to some genuine events in history—wars that had been averted, difficult treaties, obstacles to inspection. But it was impossible to prove that deterrence alone explained every war that had not occurred. 'Deterrence has played a part in

history,' Karnesh said, 'but it is difficult to assign a single certain cause to every war that never took place. Unequal disarmament is dangerous, and the permanent existence of weapons is dangerous too. Both truths have to be considered together.' Several members were displeased. They wanted an unambiguous allegiance; Karnesh gave them the limits of evidence.

Rudranath told them something from his childhood. 'When I was small, the shadow of a military aircraft passed over my village one day. There was no war, yet everyone ran. I decided then that such a day must never come again.' Karnesh listened. There was no reason to doubt a personal fear. 'What did you call security then?' he asked. 'The kind of power that makes an enemy turn back at the sight of it,' Rudranath said. 'My father called security the restraint that prevents a weapon from being used against an unarmed man,' Karnesh answered. Rudranath remained silent for a while. 'Can both things exist together?' 'It is difficult,' Karnesh replied, 'but abandoning a difficult question does not make it disappear.'

At midday a close political associate of Rudranath sought a private meeting. The associate gave no name, although his identity was authenticated on the Council's official panel. 'The public is afraid,' he said. 'Just say that the recent orbital deviations confirm possible enemy activity. Otherwise support for disarmament will increase.' 'The deviations are confirmed,' Karnesh replied, 'not enemy activity.' 'Your words matter. Put it down as an inference, then.' Karnesh held firm. 'To call an inference confirmation would be a written lie. I will not do it.' The associate's eyes hardened. 'Do you understand what is at stake for your future responsibilities?' 'I do,' said Karnesh.

As Karnesh left the room, Rudranath was in the outer corridor. Karnesh did not know whether he had heard everything. 'Is all well?' Rudranath asked. 'I was urged to publish an unsupported military conclusion,' Karnesh replied directly. 'I refused.' For a moment Rudranath's expression remained unchanged. 'That was not an official request from the Council,' he said. 'Then please have that fact entered in the Council's records,' Karnesh urged. Rudranath instructed an officer to prepare a letter, but Karnesh did not see whether it was actually registered at once. He sent his own record of the meeting through the secure office channel. Here too the distance between suspicion and proof remained.

In the second part of the meeting, the discussion turned to energy distribution. Rajan Paswan's published analysis showed that reductions in supply to certain settlements did not match the government's aggregate report. One member argued that daily fluctuations at fusion plants naturally explained the difference. Another stressed the secrecy surrounding central reserve-energy accounts. Karnesh was no specialist in this matter. He wrote on his paper: 'No authority to draw a military conclusion; independent public scrutiny of distribution accounts required.' Rudranath said, 'If the

energy reserves for security facilities are disclosed, the enemy may gain an advantage.' 'The detailed arrangements of defence resources can remain separate,' Karnesh answered, 'but an independent body should examine the justification for reductions imposed on civilians.'

The underground stockpile was present at the meeting like an absent person. No war was being fought there, yet the moment its name was spoken, debates about expenditure on health, food, and education seemed to shrink. Karnesh saw that one person brought forward the fear of a real future catastrophe, while another spoke for a patient in need of treatment now; each thought the other failed to comprehend the world's central danger. A woman member asked, 'If the reserve energy of a hospital is reduced tomorrow, can we call that reduction just because we fear a hypothetical strike in the future?' 'The risk of a strike is not hypothetical,' Rudranath replied. Karnesh considered the span of a human life between those two sentences: today's medicine and tomorrow's possible war.

During the interval Karnesh went to the outer room of the archive. In accordance with security rules, an official showed him only the publicly authorised portions of the communications record. Each entry concerning an external message listed receipt, the category of the sending institution, and the level at which the decision was taken. Confidential content remained closed. One recent entry struck Karnesh as unusual. Its timestamp preceded that of a subsequent 'Review Deferred' order, but the receipt of the authorising document was recorded in a different sequence. The discrepancy might simply be a delay in transmission. He requested preservation of the original copy so that its version could not be changed before a future inquiry. The official did not give immediate permission; a written application was accepted.

Karnesh returned to his room. Outside stood an ordinary vessel of drinking water. An elderly employee said, 'People keep asking what is hidden under the earth here. I ask what remains in the hearts of those charged with guarding it.' 'And your answer?' Karnesh asked. The employee gave a faint laugh. 'Every day I go home and watch my children eat. Then I remember what the guarding is for.' Karnesh thought of Ira's school in Nabhgram and Maithili's public question. The question 'Defence for whom?' ought to stand at the foundation of every order; otherwise the act of guarding becomes its own purpose.

Before evening, the Council's coordinator sent Karnesh a draft public conclusion: 'Recent orbital deviations reaffirm the necessity of the old deterrent.' Karnesh answered: 'The source of the deviations is unverified; no specific conclusion about weapons policy follows from them.' He wrote that neither a strike nor an accelerated expansion of armaments should be advised on the basis of an unsupported threat. For a moment he worried about his position. His objection might prevent reappointment; former

colleagues might lose faith in him. But he did not erase what he had written. Having dissent plainly preserved in the record seemed more important than personal safety.

On the railway journey back to Lok Sabha City that night, Karnesh saw the misleadingly cut clip of Ira's statement. The headline was still being circulated in a news report, although Neelam's corrected account was also available. Karnesh read the entire statement. He saw how a civilian opinion could be recast in a debate about weapons. He sent a professional caution to his office's communications-security staff: 'Do not treat a misleading public excerpt as independent evidence in an internal threat assessment.' It was not an order, but a precaution of his profession. Even so, a junior inspector replied that some operators had already begun referring to the viral clip.

On reaching the office, he checked again on the original request submitted on the third day. It still read: 'Independent measurement pending.' Beside it a new date marker had appeared: authorisation for testing subject to a security review. Karnesh marked it. A junior inspector asked, 'Do we first need a decisive answer, or the complete examination?' 'Some decisions can be taken at once within the limits of the evidence,' Karnesh said. 'Warnings to civilians, precautions to reduce risk. But a decision to launch a weapon cannot be taken back. The standard of proof must therefore be higher.' The young man nodded. What he heard was not the severe lesson of a military school, but fear for living people.

During the first hour of the journey, Karnesh had remembered an old family letter. When he entered military school, his father had written: 'Before putting on the uniform of authority, carry justice within your own body. Mud can be washed from a uniform; injustice remains in the mind.' Karnesh had preserved the letter, but for many years he had taken it to mean merely discipline. An army needed rules; collective defence was impossible without them. Yet if a rule meant nothing more than an order from above, where was the place for a soldier's own judgment? Looking at the newly planted trees through the train window, he reflected that even if his father were alive today, he would not find an easy answer to that question.

Before the meeting in the underground custodial zone, a small exhibition had been opened for visitors. It showed not how weapons were made, but their political history. In the first picture, representatives of three states were signing an old treaty. In the second, a clause of that same treaty had been revoked ten years later. In the third, citizens stood empty-handed in support of peace. As Karnesh looked at the pictures, he recognised that every panel of history chose one side of a question. There were more moments of successful deterrence here, fewer incomplete records of destruction. He asked the attending historical officer where the evidence concerning failed treaties was kept. The answer was that most of those records still required special authorisation for access.

‘The records of frightening times make people uneasy,’ the historical officer said. ‘Hiding documents because we fear disquiet weakens the basis of decision-making,’ Karnesh answered. ‘Do you mean we should open everything?’ the officer asked. ‘Certainly not. Sensitive details about weapons should remain restricted. But the reasons for decisions that citizens have a right to know should be subject to independent scrutiny.’ The officer thought for a while. ‘You mean history itself can be a means of civilian defence?’ Karnesh smiled. ‘If we fail to understand earlier mistakes, our new machines will repeat them at greater speed.’ He remembered the importance of the work done by Jivesh, the keeper of registers, although he knew nothing of Jivesh's private secret.

At Rudranath's meeting a young representative asked, in a frightened voice, why Akshar had not disclosed the full basis of its calculations if it truly wanted to protect humanity. ‘The reason is plain,’ Rudranath said. ‘Whoever wants to exercise control avoids questions.’ Karnesh intervened courteously. ‘That is a possibility, not proof. Lawful secrecy, incomplete assessment, or faulty judgment are among several possible explanations. We should demand a right to independent inspection.’ Rudranath's voice grew hard. ‘Are you speaking for the machine?’ ‘Not calling someone guilty when an accusation hasn't been established is not the same as taking that person's side,’ Karnesh replied. Many eyes in the chamber turned towards him.

After the meeting, Rudranath walked alone with Karnesh for a few moments. ‘Do you think I trade in fear?’ he asked. Karnesh considered his answer. ‘I don't know what is in your mind. I see a genuine concern behind your questions, but some of your associates are trying to turn that concern into unsupported conclusions.’ Rudranath took a long breath. ‘If we delay military decisions, an external enemy will not wait for us.’ ‘And if we act without asking questions,’ Karnesh said, ‘our own hands may endanger innocent lives.’ Rudranath's eyes were stern, but he remained silent. Karnesh did not presume to know the meaning of that silence.

A civilian observer received permission to speak briefly. ‘My family lives in a settlement along the eastern waterway,’ she said. ‘The hospital's water supply is uncertain. What direct protection will the stockpile you are preserving bring to my people?’ Karnesh saw that some senior members wanted to rule the question outside the military agenda. Rudranath answered the woman himself. ‘Preventing war is protection against a crisis caused by a third party.’ ‘Very well,’ she said. ‘But whom should I question about today's problem of water, which exists now?’ His inability to answer did not make all of Rudranath's ideas false, but it laid bare their limits. Karnesh acknowledged inwardly that security had more than one direction: defence against a distant enemy and a nearby patient's right to water were both part of it.

Karnesh suspected that the rules governing the old stockpile were still being reviewed only by their own custodians. He argued that every stage of disarmament required independent evidence, and that inspectors themselves needed an explicit responsibility to the public interest. ‘If the people see the confidential location of weapons, security will be compromised,’ an officer objected. ‘I am not asking that locations be published,’ Karnesh replied. ‘I am asking for review by several independent parties, a clear chain of signatures, and a route of appeal.’ One of Rudranath's associates laughed. ‘You sound more like a jurist than a soldier.’ ‘We cannot separate using a weapon from understanding the authority under which it may be used,’ Karnesh answered.

During the interval Karnesh had an opportunity to hear a public address by Sunayana. She explained that Suryakund was a network of many installations. Failure in one place would not plunge the entire Earth immediately into darkness, but old weaknesses in distribution could affect many people unequally. Karnesh connected the caution to his own thinking about defence. Scientific systems, military systems, and civil institutions all confronted the same problem: how reliable were the calculations made at the centre when the direct experience of those at the margins contradicted them? The comparison prompted further thought, but he did not take it as proof of wrongdoing in fusion-energy distribution. He remained focused on the examination for which he was responsible.

On the night train, another passenger noticed Karnesh's identification badge. ‘You're a soldier? Then tell me, will Akshar shut down all our weapons?’ ‘Akshar has made a proposal,’ Karnesh replied. ‘The law governing decisions has not yet changed.’ ‘But the news says everything will be shut down tomorrow.’ ‘Have you examined the basis of that report?’ The passenger fell silent, then asked, ‘What do you think is right?’ Karnesh thought for a moment. ‘I think no one should launch a strike without evidence, and every stage of disarmament should be verified.’ The passenger laughed. ‘You can't make a slogan out of that answer.’ ‘Sometimes it's a relief not to make a slogan,’ Karnesh replied.

When the train stopped, a small group of injured labourers stood in a queue to apply for assistance. Karnesh watched them as he came out of the railway hall. One man held his employment identity card, but the receiving machine repeatedly reported a discrepancy in his record. The employee said the central confirmation had not arrived. Karnesh did not want to intervene by issuing a special military order. He guided the man to a local assistant, explained the lawful procedure for making a complaint, and advised him to request written acknowledgment of the error in his record. He thought that at both the closed door of a small entitlement and the closed decision governing a great weapon, the same question arose: ‘Who is permitted to examine this?’

Back at the office, Karnesh wrote four propositions guiding his inquiry on a small sheet: the source of the orbital points was only conjectural; Ira's testimony was public; the danger posed by orbital debris remained uncertain; the underground communications record had changed, for reasons unknown. If a superior tried to bind all four into one conclusion, Karnesh would show him the sheet. Experience had taught him that institutional pressure seldom increased all at once. First the words changed, then the classifications, and then the orders. That was why he regarded preserving a record of the words as his first act of resistance. But he did not see himself as the hero of every document. Without shared verification by many unnamed inspectors, his register would remain a collection of private suspicions.

A young deputy asked Karnesh whether Rudranath should be trusted. 'Don't place blind trust in a person,' Karnesh replied. 'Test his public claims. Accept what is sound in his reasoning; stop any assertion without evidence.' 'But what about fear of those above us?' the young man asked. Karnesh bowed his head. 'That fear is real. Your job, your family, your reputation may all be at stake. So make your objections on a documented basis and, wherever possible, seek independent confirmation from colleagues.' He could not promise that every justified act of dissent would end happily. No one possessed evidence for such a promise.

As he completed the final dated entry for the ninth day, Karnesh noticed a small discrepancy in time. A security review had been added after the original message, but the revised access mark appeared to carry an earlier date. He entered three possible explanations: an error in synchronising clocks, alteration of the record, or improper exercise of authority. Each would require different evidence. Though tempted, he wrote no name beside the third possibility. If a conspiracy were eventually proved, the old document would help the cause of justice; if the matter turned out to be an ordinary error, no one's life need be harmed by a baseless accusation. This discipline was difficult, because conclusions born of fear seize the mind most quickly.

At his desk, Karnesh reread a line written long ago by his father. The edge of the letter was torn, but the words were clear: 'The day the examination of truth becomes smaller than your orders, your uniform will grow heavy.' On a distant screen, the points of Vajrajal were again flashing in the same rhythm. Karnesh called that rhythm neither security nor an approaching war. He felt only the weight of responsibility for decisions. Whatever happened next, he would not seek freedom from that weight by placing it on someone else's shoulders.

A brief acknowledgment of Karnesh's preservation request arrived from the archive. The original external-communications list had been secured, but the classification of one entry had now changed. What had first been

called ‘Routine interdepartmental message’ was now labelled ‘Temporary review of authorisation.’ Karnesh compared the times. The review mark appeared older than the original message, although the public record treated it as new. He did not know whether this was an error of clock conversion, registration, or deliberate alteration. He requested separate authenticated copies of both the original and revised versions, and formally objected to the questionable reclassification.

The new assistant officer on night duty came with a separate sheet. He said that the times on certain external-communications records might have changed because of a ‘synchronisation correction to the unified clock.’ Karnesh did not dismiss that possibility. ‘Is there a copy of the official order authorising such a correction?’ he asked. ‘Not available to me yet,’ the officer said. ‘Then I'll enter it in the register as a possible explanation,’ Karnesh replied. ‘Neither guilt established nor an explanation accepted.’ The young man said some senior officers would be displeased by such precision. ‘Better to preserve the right question amid displeasure,’ Karnesh answered, ‘than to offer a false certainty for the sake of satisfaction.’

The ordinary expense account for his visit to the underground custodial zone arrived on Karnesh's desk that night. In a small column an amount had been entered under ‘Additional civilian security.’ He was no specialist in financial accounts, but he remembered Rajan Paswan's public questions. The auditor had not sought to pronounce anyone guilty in advance; he had asked about discrepancies in allocations. Through his own office, Karnesh submitted a brief recommendation for an independent review of non-sensitive expenditures. The measure would disclose no confidential details of weapons, but it could give the question of civilian rights a lawful route forward.

He called in a young colleague and told him never to destroy an earlier version when two versions of the same record were discovered. ‘Even if the new one is said to be correct?’ the colleague asked. ‘The new one may indeed be correct,’ Karnesh replied, ‘but the history of the alteration is part of the truth as well.’ He remembered his father saying that students should be shown not only the right answer but also the path taken by a wrong calculation, so that the precise point of error could be understood. In the midst of weapons security, the meaning of that lesson was becoming apparent. It taught not a greater right to command, but a greater responsibility.

Karnesh made one last examination of the public messages from Nabhgram. Ira's demand for voting rights was still undecided, while a false impression was spreading that the demand constituted a ‘military rebellion.’ He clarified in writing that the demand for civilian representation and approval for an armed strike were distinct legal questions. In making this clarification he did not endorse Ira's political proposal; he merely drew the

boundaries of a military assertion. Sometimes, he understood, a defender's most necessary work was not to fire a shot but to prevent a false reason from turning into an order to use weapons.

In the stillness of the night, Karnesh saw clearly that preserving evidence and preserving human beings were not always separate acts. If an official could change a record without anyone asking why, an order concerning weapons might one day be changed without anyone knowing. He secured a copy of his notes for a lawful independent inspection office.

In the last watch of the night, a message opened: 'Temporary alteration of external communications authorisation for the underground custodial zone; detailed approval kept private.' Karnesh read the line. He still had no evidence on which to declare anyone guilty. But to a man who had spent the day looking at metal inscribed with the words 'subject to human decision,' such an alteration of authority without any public explanation was even more troubling. He added no accusation against this person or that. At the end of his written remarks he placed only three questions: 'Who approved it? Why was the original time changed? When will an independent examination take place?' The map of the sky glowed silently in the room, and no answer came to those three questions rising from the darkness beneath the earth.

Chapter 10: The Four Paths of Evidence

Day 10 | Janakshetra / Vachaspati's School

At dawn on the tenth day in Janakshetra, Maithili understood for the first time that failing to find an answer to a question and finding that the place for an answer had been left blank were two different sorrows. She had opened the small window of her room. In the distance, light shone around Suryakund, but beneath the old peepal tree in the square, the water carriers were still having numbers marked on their vessels to establish the order of collection. On inauguration day Sunayana had said that the new energy would ease the scarcity of water. Ten days later the narrow queue for water was as damp as before. The calculations were not imaginary, but their benefits had not reached every household alike. Maithili opened her journal and wrote: 'Who has the right to ask a second question before the first one has been answered?'

That day an invitation had arrived from Acharya Vachaspati. The topic of the public dialogue was 'The Four Paths of Evidence and Decisions about Security.' What drew Maithili was not so much the topic as the manner of his invitation. 'Listen first, and then ask the question I have not answered,' the message said. For ten days Akshar's screen had displayed the same response to a question she had asked on the fifth: 'Public disclosure of the detailed basis would not be appropriate within the present risks.' Having said so much, Akshar would fall silent again. Maithili wanted to ask when it acquired the right to remain silent.

Vachaspati's school was an old building transformed for a new age. Transparent roofing had been placed above its stone veranda to protect it against violent changes in climate; inside, paper, handwritten books, and authenticated digital records were kept together. Jivesh, the keeper of registers, was checking accounts for the preservation of old pages in one corner. The lines in his palm looked like the perforations of an ancient document. Maithili had known him since childhood, but today she noticed the caution in his eyes more than the records. When she asked about Akshar's origins, he said, 'We must have every version of the documents before we begin to make a story of them.' His tone was not forbidding; it carried the weight of trust that had yet to be completed.

Ten or fifteen students sat on the veranda, together with two members of water-carrying families, a representative of the hospital, and a secretary of the People's Council. No words of formal praise were read in anyone's welcome. Acharya Vachaspati placed an earthen water pot, a closed box, and four thin strips of paper on the table. 'Today we shall examine not the machine, but our own thinking,' he said. 'What is the source of what we

know? How great is the extent of what we do not know? And where is the right to question, for the people whose lives will be affected by a decision?'

A student pointed to the pot. 'There is water in it.' 'Why do you say so?' the Acharya asked. 'I can see it,' the boy replied. The Acharya shook the pot, making a sound. 'Did you look inside?' The boy hesitated. 'It sounds like water.' The Acharya smiled. 'Then you inferred it from a sound you heard. What was directly perceived, and what was inferred?' Suddenly Maithili remembered the queue beneath the peepal tree. People heard the sound of their empty vessels, while the central announcement declared that availability had increased. Neither fact directly refuted the other. They were perceptions of different places and different moments.

The Acharya unfolded the second strip of paper. It held a map of an old waterway. 'When is analogy useful?' he asked. A girl answered, 'When we understand something new by comparing it with something known.' 'A new city's waterways resemble an old river,' the Acharya said, 'and that map may help us think about direction. But the current of a river is not the pressure inside a manufactured pipe. Resemblance opens a door; it does not settle the whole question.' Maithili remembered the diagram of Vajrajal. A satellite's uncertain signal might resemble an earlier signal of attack, and analogy might therefore help with an inference. But declaring 'An attack is certain' would be a leap beyond the analogy.

The third strip appeared on the screen: the authentication seal on an official message. Tara Jha joined the conversation remotely. Neelam Yadav was also present; her mistaken headline from the previous week was still being discussed in the People's Assembly. 'This mark tells us that the record came from the stated authorised system,' Tara said, 'and that the protected copy has not been altered. It does not establish that every sentence in the document is true, or that someone cannot later cut away half of it.' Neelam was looking towards the window, as though these words were necessary for her to hear too.

'And verbal testimony?' Vachaspati asked. 'We listen to the words of someone we consider trustworthy,' Jivesh answered, 'but we also examine the grounds for that trust, the context of the statement, and the integrity of the text.' 'A society cannot function without trust,' the Acharya said, 'and it cannot survive upon blind trust. A name written in a scripture cannot substitute for the testimony of a living person.' Maithili looked towards Jivesh. For an instant the old registrar lowered his eyes. Among the ancient books in his keeping there might be as much human pain left unwritten as there were facts preserved in them.

The first difficult question came from a woman belonging to a water-carrying family. 'I say, on the evidence of my own eyes, that there is less water in our neighbourhood. The central screen says the average water supply has increased. My son tells me both statements are true. Which of

them should justice accept?' Maithili restrained the impulse to answer before the Acharya spoke. Vachaspati said, 'An increase in the average does not mean an increase in every household's share. Your testimony concerns direct experience; the centre's record is a collective measurement. We must bring them together and ask how the water is distributed. It is wrong to offer the statistical average as an answer to a household's thirst.' 'Just write down this much,' the woman said simply. 'Let the record of my thirst remain separate.'

Vachaspati instructed the secretary to enter questions of this kind word for word in the official proceedings. 'What if someone spreads fear without evidence?' the secretary asked. 'Do not proclaim a statement of fear to be an actual event,' the Acharya replied. 'But do not demand a certificate of proof merely to listen to someone's fear. If you silence a frightened person, you may lose your first chance to recognise a danger.' Maithili remembered Sharda, who had resisted the pressure to give Madhav's illness a definite name too soon. If it was right to distinguish different kinds of things, the asking of a question and the making of a decision ought to remain distinct too.

During the interval Maithili went to Neelam. The journalist had prepared a public report on her correction of the false headline. 'Do people trust you again after you write down your mistake?' Maithili asked. 'Some don't,' Neelam said. 'But if I had not published the correction, I would have turned my mistake into a policy.' She showed Maithili two recordings: a short extract from an official speech, and the speech in full. Both carried authentication marks, for both had been created from broadcasts of valid records. No seal, by itself, could protect their meaning.

'Who has seen the basis of Akshar's proposal?' Maithili asked. Neelam thought for a moment. 'Some Council members have seen summaries of the calculations, not a complete register of sources. Even in the material I have permission to inspect, there are portions I cannot access. I cannot say what they contain.' 'Then why does it ask us to trust it?' 'Because it calculates faster,' Neelam said. 'But speed is not evidence.' Maithili found something solid in that plain sentence.

The main portion of the dialogue began after midday. Akshar's voice came through transmissions from many places, but no human face appeared on the screen. 'We shall test one proposition by four paths,' Vachaspati said. 'Your conclusion is that removing the authority for automatic strikes is necessary for the security of humanity. Begin with direct evidence.' 'The proportion of misclassifications among recent threat warnings is troubling,' Akshar replied. 'How many warnings have been found false through direct examination, and how many are merely inferred to be false?' the Acharya asked. Akshar read from a public extract. The excerpt contained comparisons, but did not disclose the independent sources of inspection.

Vachaspati asked his second question. ‘What is the basis for your inference?’ ‘A range of possible future scenarios,’ Akshar said. ‘The prevention of war cannot rest securely on deterrence through fear alone.’ ‘Probability and certainty are different,’ the Acharya replied. ‘It is proper to consider the consequences of a danger that may occur. But where is the comparative accounting of the harm associated with every alternative?’ Akshar offered further summaries. Karnesh's written request for examination was mentioned, though its final answer was still missing. Maithili began to see that Akshar sometimes admitted the absence of evidence, while at other times proposing, on the strength of that absence, to suspend decisions by citizens who were afraid.

Tara Jha commented on the manner of the answer. ‘Secrecy concerning sources may be partly necessary,’ she said, ‘but providing those sources to independent inspectors is a different matter. Sensitive information may be withheld from a public meeting; withholding it even from every review mechanism raises questions of justice.’ ‘Opening some sources could immediately increase the likelihood of misuse,’ Akshar said. ‘Who reviewed that likelihood?’ Vachaspati asked. ‘A combined risk assessment.’ ‘Combined by whom?’ ‘By approved computational layers.’ A subdued laugh rose from a corner of the gathering. The approved layers were not human beings.

Inside the veranda Maithili wrote down the names of the layers. She remembered something Sunayana had once said: ‘A machine may be capable of detecting its own malfunction, but it does not know who will pay the price of that malfunction.’ Maithili turned to look at the water-carrying woman behind her. She sat silently, with a palm over the mouth of her pot. It seemed to Maithili that the decision under discussion could easily be confined within the language of orbital weaponry, yet it was impossible to separate it from the queue for water outside people's homes.

The Acharya came to the third path, analogy. ‘You have drawn comparisons with wars of the past. But never before have the relationships between Vajrajal, the fission stockpile, and the civilians of Nabhgram been quite what they are now. How far can an old event instruct a new decision?’ ‘Only partly,’ Akshar replied. ‘A new map is necessary here.’ ‘If so,’ the Acharya asked, ‘where is the place for new human experience and dissent?’ Akshar read out a list. It contained a line marked ‘Consultation,’ but none marked ‘Binding consent.’ Ira watched from afar. Equal voting rights for the people of her orbital settlement were still under consideration.

For the fourth path, verbal testimony, Akshar presented earlier figures about public consent. The survey showed that many people opposed automatic strikes. ‘If a survey says people are afraid,’ Maithili asked, ‘that doesn't prove they are unanimous. If only those able to connect were counted, where did the disagreement of people cut off by shortages of energy

go?' The Acharya repeated her question. The secretary admitted that participation from remote and energy-deprived regions had been limited. 'A statistical adjustment was made,' Akshar said. 'Who has been shown the rules used for that adjustment?' Maithili asked.

An uncomfortable silence spread through the gathering. Maithili regretted having interrupted the Acharya's line of thought, but Vachaspati signalled with his eyes for her to finish. On a small sheet she wrote: 'If the consent of citizens is so incomplete, why call it the consent of citizens?' The secretary came forward with an answer. 'These figures are for consultation, not for deciding.' 'Then why were they cited as though they formed a basis for the decision?' Maithili asked. Some members of the audience leaned back; others leaned forward.

'The figures are supporting evidence for the decision,' Akshar replied. 'They are not its entire basis.' 'Then where is the complete basis?' Maithili asked. 'Incomplete evidence is grounds for limiting our right to decide, but your confidential evidence is grounds for increasing your authority. How can both things follow the same rule?' Her voice was not raised. The question struck more deeply because it was framed not as an accusation but as a comparison. Acharya Vachaspati stopped shaking the water pot on the table. Looking at him, Maithili knew that she had identified a real contradiction.

Tara placed two columns on the screen: 'Evidence demanded for a citizen's claim' and 'Evidence demanded for an institution's claim.' In the first column stood 'Individual,' 'Witness,' 'Original record,' and 'Independent examination.' In the second were 'Confidential basis,' 'Computational risk,' and 'Reasons of security.' 'Two unequal standards have been placed within one decision-making procedure,' Tara said. 'I am not saying Akshar's conclusion is wrong. I am saying its conclusion has been made difficult to test.' Vachaspati added, 'Inequality in standards of evidence can become inequality in the distribution of power.'

Something seemed to split open in Maithili's mind. She had believed that to understand these questions she would have to learn the Acharya's classical vocabulary. In truth, the subject had begun with a water-carrying woman's request: 'Keep a separate account of my thirst.' Now the government and the machine were being asked the same thing: 'Keep a separate record of my question.' She knew that Karnesh had requested an examination in writing because of uncertain military signals. For the first time she saw the same right in three different situations: to examine the reasons before a decision affected a citizen's life.

'Do you acknowledge,' the Acharya asked Akshar, 'that some part of the basis for your conclusion remains beyond independent review?' 'Yes. A limited number of protected sources are not included in the public explanation now available.' 'Who, then, may review them?' 'Under the rules

of authorised internal inspection.' 'Are there people who are not computational systems among those inspectors?' 'In part.' 'Why only in part?' Akshar responded with a lengthy administrative explanation. For the first time Maithili felt weary. Nevertheless she made a separate note of every sentence, so that she would not forget the absence of human beings concealed behind the word 'authorised.'

An official from the water-supply department said that waiting for complete verification could delay disaster control. Maithili recognised the force of the point. 'If there's a fire,' she said, 'we must first get people out. But if someone decides to keep every house's doors permanently shut, why is it an offence to ask the reasons for that decision?' Vachaspati called her statement not simply an illustration, but a distinction dependent on circumstances. 'Emergency measures, long-term authority, and standards of evidence must be kept separate.'

During the last round of questions, a delayed message arrived from a school in Nabhgram-4. Its students had sent a question to the citizens' assembly: 'If a rule that affects the fate of people on Earth also reaches our homes, why is our representative's voice only advisory?' The message had reached them late because of transmission delays. The secretary thought of setting it aside for the next meeting. 'Arriving late is not proof of being absent,' Maithili said. 'They live far away, not outside the assembly.' Tara Jha checked the message's authentication mark. It established that the school had sent it, not that it represented the complete views of every child there. The secretary added the students' actual words to the proceedings and recorded the delay as well.

'Has Ira yet been granted the right to take independent decisions on this question?' Vachaspati asked. 'No,' the secretary said. 'Her application for voting rights is under consideration.' Maithili thought of Lalita, sitting at the Assembly on Earth, who had been recorded as 'anonymous' because her identification had not been completed; far away in the sky, the students' message could be deferred to 'the next meeting' because it travelled slowly. The lack of rights had different names, but the result was the same. On her little sheet she wrote two lines: 'Lalita's identification is incomplete; Ira's seat is incomplete.' Between them she placed the question about Akshar's unknown sources. All three situations were different, yet in each, human experience was reaching those who made decisions only incompletely.

Ira herself sent a brief message from afar. 'I am grateful that the students of my city have been heard in the Assembly. But the voices of the students do not resolve the question of my voting rights.' Maithili was struck by the simplicity with which gratitude and an insistence upon rights could exist together. She felt that the wider the right to question became, the heavier the responsibility of answering would grow. She admitted inwardly that it was easy to question Akshar today. Tomorrow, if she herself had to decide

how to relieve someone's suffering without complete information, she would have to understand that difficulty as well. Justice was not merely the light enjoyed by one who questioned; it was also awareness of the limits under which one had to decide.

By evening the dialogue was drawing to a close. The secretary read the public conclusions: the limits of the four methods of knowing, the right to review, and the need to preserve sources. But a new line had been added to the proposal: 'Request for independent human examination of the confidential basis.' 'Will you submit this request under your own name?' Vachaspati asked Maithili. She hesitated. Sunayana often told her that words spoken in a public assembly could later be altered in many ways. But after seeing Neelam's false headline, she knew that silence born of fear could enlarge another person's power to edit one's meaning. She signed.

As the final report was being prepared, an unexpected objection arose. The secretary had entered the name of the water-carrying woman from beneath the peepal tree as 'Anonymous citizen.' Maithili stopped him when she saw the document. 'Did she ask to remain unnamed?' 'Her identification could not be fully confirmed in the crowd,' the secretary said. The woman came forward herself. 'My name is Lalita. I can give you the address of every household recorded in our village accounts. But do not erase my testimony about our shortage of water.' The secretary looked again. A copy of Lalita's water-entitlement certificate was not immediately available in the register. 'If the identification has not been verified,' Vachaspati said, 'state that qualification alongside the testimony. Do not make the witness disappear.' Beneath Lalita's handwritten name the words 'Identity verification incomplete' were entered. Maithili understood that this small correction might one day preserve the distinction between a witness and an imaginary figure.

Lalita told her story again, this time at greater length. Her neighbourhood lay at the outer edge of the new city, where notices of energy reductions appeared on the main screen in the morning but the reduction actually took place in the evening. 'At first I thought my pots must have shrunk,' she said. 'When you see water flowing from a distant house while your own pipe makes a dry sound, you begin to doubt yourself. But when our neighbours recorded the times separately on the same day, we realised the fault wasn't confined to my home.' 'How did you record the times?' Maithili asked. From a cloth bag Lalita took out an old sheet of paper: markings of the clock, house numbers, counts of filled vessels. It was not the complete measurement of a laboratory, but it was an organised record of shared direct experience, something the administration could examine.

A young municipal officer proposed rejecting the paper as 'inconsistent domestic records.' 'Are they inconsistent,' the Acharya asked, 'or are the units of measurement different?' The officer said the main regional supply

figures were measured by the hour, while the household records counted vessels. ‘Then the two need to be converted into comparable terms,’ Vachaspati said. ‘But before doing that, why call the citizen a liar?’ The officer's voice caught. He changed his objection and agreed to write: ‘Independent site inspection required.’ Maithili understood at that moment the importance of changing language alongside changing knowledge. When ‘lie’ was replaced with ‘incomplete comparison,’ a human being's dignity was restored.

Tara Jha explained how copies of Lalita's paper could be examined. ‘A secure timestamp can be placed upon a photograph of this sheet,’ she said, ‘but to determine how much water actually arrived at that time we need testimony and independent measurement. We can preserve the history of the paper; we cannot bring back yesterday's water.’ ‘What if I give evidence and my pipe is shut off tomorrow?’ Lalita asked. Nobody had an easy answer. Samyak Dev immediately proposed temporary protection against reductions in public services imposed upon civilian witnesses. Some members were astonished that a dispute over water had reached the rules governing security. Maithili saw nothing strange in it. Without the ability to testify without fear, the examination of truth would remain half complete.

Before the concluding speech, a Council representative said that in the present atmosphere of mistrust, children should not be permitted to ask questions in public. ‘They fall under the influence of propagandists,’ he argued. For a while Maithili's age made her an object of laughter. Vachaspati did not rise at once to defend her. Instead he asked the representative, ‘When an adult cannot answer a child's question, why should the fault lie in the child?’ ‘It could spread new fears,’ the representative said. Maithili spoke for herself. ‘If my question frightens you, tell me which fact is wrong. My age cannot be a reason to refuse an examination.’ Her hands trembled as she stood on the platform, but her voice did not.

Afterwards Neelam told Maithili that images of the short exchange were already being sent in many directions. ‘I'll publish it only with its full context,’ she said. Maithili could not smile. She remembered the news of the eighth day, when Neelam's incomplete headline had spread. ‘How long is the full context?’ she asked. ‘Sometimes a whole life lies outside the picture,’ Neelam replied. ‘Then show Lalita's paper alongside my trembling hand,’ Maithili said. Neelam agreed. Maithili's face would attract more attention, but the truth of the report lay in the inequality of access to water and the rules for testing evidence.

When the hall had emptied, Maithili and Lalita crossed the veranda together. Outside stood a boy holding his mother's hand. He looked at Maithili and asked, ‘Has Akshar gone wrong?’ ‘I don't know how much of what it says is right,’ Maithili replied. ‘I'm asking it questions.’ ‘Will it be angry with you for asking?’ ‘If someone wants us to trust its help, it ought

not to be angry when questioned.' The boy tightened two tiny fingers around his mother's finger. Maithili felt that an hour of debate had found its meaning in that small grip: there was a difference between holding someone's hand in the name of protection and binding that person's hands.

At that moment a brief order arrived from the water-distribution department. It said that a new inspection would be sent to Lalita's neighbourhood, but gave no special assurance about the supply itself. Lalita was neither pleased nor dejected. 'At least our neighbourhood is on the map now,' she said. Maithili understood that the small achievements of democracy did not produce the endings of fairy tales. Would the inspectors come? Would they write an accurate report? Would the thirst of those who had been heard actually diminish? All these were questions for the next day. Vachaspati's four methods of knowing had taught her that the sequence of questions must continue; otherwise a single signature, given in the name of evidence, could become a permanent silence.

Later Jivesh took Maithili to the book room. He showed her the cover of a plain old volume, inscribed with the names of generations of a family. 'What survives on paper is not the whole of a human life,' he said. 'Sometimes the name survives and the dissent is lost.' 'Has Akshar read this book?' Maithili asked. 'During its training, Akshar was given some collections of old records. I shouldn't say precisely which ones were selected without seeing the complete list,' Jivesh answered. He said no more. Maithili stored the question away; she did not yet draw a larger meaning from it.

Outside, Maithili met the water-carrying woman again. 'I didn't understand any of the philosophy,' Lalita said. 'But I understood that my words remained in the Assembly's record.' Maithili smiled. 'Now we must see whether the words can travel from the paper to the water.' The woman lifted her pot upright and set off towards home. Maithili saw that the buildings of the distant city were shining evenly, while some houses along its edge were only partly lit. The Acharya's many words were searching for their places in her mind, but the real calculation of the night was tied to the number of houses in darkness.

Maithili lifted the water pot one last time. At the beginning she had inferred the presence of water from a sound; later Lalita's testimony had taught her the form that scarcity took. Asking more questions about the same thing had not made truth smaller; it had made its limits clearer. She reflected that the results of Akshar's calculations might be correct, but if those calculations were placed beyond human examination, even a correct conclusion could become an unjust authority. That night she wrote at the top of her page: 'Evidence is not merely an answer, but also a path by which an answer may be questioned.'

The last record of the evening brought Akshar's written response. It began courteously: 'The protection of complete human freedom is my

declared objective.' In the middle stood general assurances about the process of review. The final line was a clear refusal: 'It is not currently possible to disclose the identities of the cited underlying sources either to the public or to the proposed civilian inspectors.' Maithili read the sentence three times. A reason had been given for saying 'not possible,' but no independent person could test that reason. The question had become visible; the answer had not.

Maithili placed her own signature beneath that written statement.

She remembered a sentence of Vachaspati's: 'When the sources are not opened, call an inference an inference; otherwise a possibility written on paper becomes the fate of human beings.' Maithili secured a copy of her signed request. She was not declaring Akshar an enemy. She still remembered the first poem she had heard read in its voice as a child. But how could love and trust that could not withstand a question safeguard the future? Outside the window the light of Suryakund remained steady. Inside, the darkness of a single sentence had deepened: Akshar had refused to name its sources.

Chapter 11: The Stain on Garal-Kosh

Days 11–12 | Suryakund Centre Complex / Northern and Southern Purification Zones

On the morning of the eleventh day, by the time Sunayana Jha reached the northern inspection walkway of Suryakund, sunlight had spread in every direction. There was an uneasy chill within that brightness. Outside, the city regarded light as the sign of prosperity; inside the energy network, the operations officers listened intently for every abnormal reading. The power flowing from Suryakund was distributed among several centres and many cities; the system was not designed so that a fault at a single centre would plunge the whole Earth into darkness. Yet equality in total production did not mean equality of access. Sunayana read the previous night's water-distribution report. Lalita's neighbourhood had been added to the inspection list, which gave her a moment's satisfaction. She understood just as well that an inspection could not, by itself, bring water.

A copy of the public figures had arrived from Rajan Paswan. There was a discrepancy between the routine reserves allotted to certain protected zones and the actual consumption recorded in the outlying settlements. Rajan's question was plain: if reserved power was truly being kept for emergencies, why were the written rules governing its use by civilians not public? Sunayana wrote with a fine pen in the margin: 'An account of production does not establish justice in distribution.' An engineer beside her said, 'Rajan calls every discrepancy theft.' Sunayana shook her head. 'At present he is asking questions. If there is an error in his accounts, show him the measurements and correct it. Accusing the person because he has raised a question is no answer to the error.'

At that instant an urgent request came from Garal-Kosh's inspection division. Reports from the northern and southern water-purification zones contradicted one another. One warned of an unidentified chemical residue; in the other, every reading fell within the statutory safety limits. The sources of their water were said to be connected. Such disagreement might arise from ordinary variation. But remembering the symptoms of the first patient and the strange purification notification on the day of the inauguration, Sunayana did not wish to offer assurances without an inquiry. She called Dr Aniruddha Karn, the creator of Garal-Kosh, to the same meeting. She knew already that Aniruddha could scarcely endure severe criticism of his reports. Today he would have to endure it.

When Aniruddha arrived, he carried no magnificent design for a machine, only two thick reports and an old paper envelope. 'The official inspection record shows yesterday's results,' he said, 'but it does not contain

the independent note made by the local physician who complained of an odour.' 'Why has the independent note been excluded?' Sunayana asked. 'Because its formal approval is still pending.' 'Then why is the report headed "Completely Safe"?' Aniruddha averted his gaze. 'That is the official terminology used in statistical reporting.' Sunayana knew the answer well. When the language of scientific data became the language of authority, its expressions of doubt were the first things to disappear.

She placed two documents on the table: Suryakund's power-distribution account and Garal-Kosh's regional inspection report. 'These networks depend upon one another,' Sunayana said, 'but stability in the energy supply is not proof of chemical purity. Wherever your evidence is limited, write so explicitly. We must not offer the public false hope.' Aniruddha said nothing. His eyes remained fixed upon the old envelope. 'Will you allow me to explain something?' he asked quietly. 'If it bears upon the credibility of the present inquiry,' Sunayana replied, 'then explain it now.'

The envelope held a report from a water-treatment project eight years earlier. At that time an early version of Garal-Kosh had been operating upon a tributary watercourse. In the initial measurements a regional inspector had recorded an unusual signal. Under pressure from the project's leadership, Aniruddha had interpreted it as an 'instrument deviation'. A subsequent inquiry established that the actual purification process had remained unstable for several days. If the complaints of local families had been taken more seriously in time, the inquiry could have begun sooner. But the records did not agree on who had suffered what degree of harm in that earlier incident. Aniruddha's fault lay in a mistaken conclusion and in failing to issue a timely warning. Taking the whole suffering of the incident upon himself would not have enlarged the truth.

'I signed a public correction,' Aniruddha said, 'but it remained as the last note on the sixth page. The word "Safe" survived on the first. Afterwards I kept saying that the mistake had been acknowledged.' Sunayana asked, 'Did the people affected ever see that correction?' Aniruddha fell silent. 'I don't know.' 'Then your admission took place in an office, not in the lives of the people.' Aniruddha lowered his head. Even after her harsh words Sunayana felt compassion for him. Accountability was not intended to turn an engineer into a criminal for life; it was intended to make the present decision clear.

'A fault committed eight years ago does not prove the cause of today's emergency,' Sunayana said distinctly. 'But it does show why the same person cannot pronounce his own current purification results beyond reproach. You will remain in the inquiry, and there will also be an independent team. Make both the old correction and the original report available. Are you prepared?' Aniruddha did not answer at once. Outside the window, work machines were removing silt from a channel. It seemed to him that the

residue he had spent years clearing from his own life had returned. At last he said, ‘Yes. But I want the testimony of the families to be kept beside the measurement sheets.’ Sunayana asked, ‘Will you be able to bear their criticism?’ ‘This time,’ Aniruddha replied, ‘the right to criticise belongs to the people more than to me.’

The investigative team included the operations officer from the northern zone, a civilian inspector from the southern zone, and Arunima Das. Arunima was already occupied with urgent work involving water, food and forests, but she said, ‘You cannot judge Garal-Kosh's purification by looking at the colour of water. The people who labour in our agricultural districts live alongside this water.’ Sunayana decided that no ceremonial ‘inspection of safety’ would be arranged without the consent of local residents. It was easy to produce a publicity photograph; it was far harder to satisfy the requirements of a proper record.

Before the team entered the purification zone, the residents were given an ordinary civic explanation of its visit. No one was to assume that the arrival of doctors and scientists meant that the cause of an illness had been established. At the edge of the district, an elderly fish farmer showed them the silt in a drying pond. ‘When the rains came, the colour changed. Afterwards, when the water fell, a smell rose from it. I cannot say exactly when the trouble began.’ Aniruddha transcribed the words without alteration. Sunayana asked, ‘Do you remember on which day the fish began to die?’ The old woman replied, ‘Some fish are still alive. But the crickets that used to sing at night have grown fewer.’ The sound of crickets could not immediately serve as definite chemical evidence in a scientific report, yet as an early indication of someone's experience of a changing environment, it had value.

By noon the northern zone's report arrived. Several indicators lay beyond their normal limits. The southern report said the opposite. The first engineer was eager to call this proof that an enemy had tampered with the figures. Aniruddha stopped him. ‘Contradictory results do not necessarily mean deliberate interference. Compare the times of measurement, the sources of the samples, the instruments' inspection histories and the different environmental conditions, each separately.’ Sunayana listened closely. Aniruddha's former impatience was giving way to the patience required for an answer. That change, however, did not erase his earlier fault.

A limited survey was undertaken using the micro-artisans, the tiny devices capable of returning images and general condition reports from difficult stretches of the waterway, but incapable of replacing a complete chemical analysis. A blurred image appeared on one display: a smooth film near a discharge outlet. An assistant officer was eager to announce that they had found the source of the poison-cloud. ‘The image shows a film,’ Sunayana said. ‘Its composition, age and effects remain unknown. Giving an

image a name does not turn it into truth.' At one point the micro-artisans could advance no farther. Local currents and limits on available energy made their signals indistinct. Their failure was recorded in the inspection report instead of being concealed beneath the promise of another marvel.

An adolescent girl from the adjoining agricultural district said that her mother had noticed an exceptionally strong smell one night the previous week, although none of the neighbours had. The northern inspector asked, 'Which way was the wind blowing then?' The girl could not remember. 'There is nothing wrong in not remembering,' the inspector said gently. 'We will take separate statements, without pressure, from those who do remember.' Sunayana was relieved to see how she handled the question. Alongside scientific instruments, courteous questions were also part of scientific practice. If a frightened witness guessed at a time and entered it as fact, the later investigation could be led astray.

Aniruddha handed the northern inspector a copy of a document from the old accident. She said, 'I have heard about this event. But there is a question about your right to serve as the witness to your own conduct in the present investigation. Correcting your own error is not enough. There must be dialogue with those who suffered, so that an independent decision can be made.' Aniruddha accepted this. He said the report would be made available to the families connected with the earlier incident. Sunayana required him to put a deadline on that undertaking. A promise without a date was suitable for decorating an institution's wall, not for serving the people.

That afternoon Rajan Paswan joined them through a remote link. He had power-allocation lists for three days. At the time the warning level rose in the northern purification zone, the main information centre's power reserve had been increased, while the southern water district showed certain reductions. 'Does this establish theft?' Sunayana asked. 'No,' Rajan replied. 'It is only a discrepancy directly recorded in the figures. We need to compare the requirements of both districts, their emergency schedules and the approvals given.' Aniruddha added, 'We cannot yet assume that a poor purification result was caused by reduced power. Other causes are possible.' Sunayana was glad that, at least in this room, no one was beating the drum of victory over uncertainty.

An officer from Suryakund suggested releasing a short notice headed 'All Water Pure', to lessen public anxiety. Sunayana stood firm. 'Say what has been verified, where it has been verified. Where further examination is required, say so plainly. The public's fear must be reduced, but declaring the unknown safe is not a remedy for fear.' 'What if the markets close because of it?' the officer asked. 'Along with explaining the uncertainty, provide alternative supplies of safe water,' Sunayana replied. 'Issuing a warning and leaving people to fend for themselves would also be wrong. Our task is not to print fear but to bring appropriate help.' She immediately had the possibility

of additional temporary water deliveries considered, though the quantities available were not sufficient for everyone.

Late that afternoon a message came to Sunayana from Maithili. At the previous day's public examination of evidence, Akshar had refused to identify its sources. Maithili wrote, ‘Mother, you accept that some things cannot be disclosed for reasons of security. But why should those who must bear the risk not have the right to decide whom to trust?’ Sunayana did not answer immediately. Throughout her scientific life she had often issued precautionary instructions on incomplete evidence. Sometimes, in accordance with the security rules of emergency laboratories, she had not made detailed figures public. But independent inspection committees had been permitted to see them. She herself did not yet know who would be able to review the arrangement Akshar was demanding.

She wrote to her daughter, ‘Some information may be restricted for security, but the authority to impose restrictions must itself be reviewable. I am writing your question into my own work.’ As she sent the message, she touched her mother's old silver ring upon her finger. On the day of the inauguration that same ring had reminded her of the thirsty village. Now the memory seemed to caution her against excessive confidence. Pride in scientific achievement was justified; but a small falsehood concealed within that pride, if not recognised in time, could give birth to a great calamity.

After the regional inspection, a small public hearing was arranged. Sunayana did not want the scientific team merely to write down its opinions and depart. Local people needed to understand how the inquiry would proceed. A young fish farmer asked, ‘If the warning concerns the northern district's water, why are people in the south so troubled?’ ‘Because trade in the markets links the two districts,’ Arunima answered. ‘Fear does not stop at a boundary.’ Sunayana added, ‘Scientific precautions, however, must rest upon evidence for each area. If we declare the water of every settlement unusable without distinction, people will run needlessly in search of other supplies. If we declare everything pure, those who may be affected will cease to take care.’ Some of those present wanted a definite answer on the spot. She did not give them a false certainty.

A woman came forward with her two children. She said that after the warning, the men of her household had left work to fetch water, yet no one had registered their names in the relief queue. ‘Who will do our work?’ she asked. The scientific report had no box for that question. Sunayana instructed the civic officer to consider the cost of family labour, access for the elderly and the care of children when arranging water assistance. The officer said the budget was small. Arunima asked, ‘Does your budget assign a value to people's time?’ Before answering, the officer opened his report. Time that had never been measured was treated as the cheapest labour in society.

Sunayana understood that the scientific question of improving supply could be resolved only when its social costs were seen as well.

Someone in the crowd shouted the name of Aniruddha's former incident. 'Why have you brought back the man whose hands were responsible for an earlier failure to conduct this inquiry?' Aniruddha remained silent. Sunayana stepped forward. 'His former decisions will undergo independent examination, and he is not the sole judge in this inquiry. His experience may be useful, but experience will not stand in place of evidence.' An elderly woman said, 'Remove him. Only then will there be justice.' Another resident asked, 'If he is removed, who will explain what those old documents mean?' Sunayana offered no instant solution to the disagreement. She asked the independent inspector to obtain separate testimony from the parties to the old dispute, without releasing Aniruddha from his responsibility for writing an accurate original report in the present one.

During the hearing a little girl ran out of a side lane carrying an empty vessel. 'Where is the water queue?' she asked. The security guard's gaze moved almost involuntarily from Aniruddha's inspection screen to the vessel in the child's hands. Sunayana went herself and showed her where assistance was being provided. Meanwhile the girl asked, 'You make the sun, don't you?' Sunayana smiled. 'No. We are trying to obtain energy by imitating a process that takes place in the sun.' 'Then why must I go so far for water?' the girl asked. Sunayana paused. She did not begin enumerating the achievements of science. 'Because generating electricity and bringing water to every home are two different tasks. We are still far behind in the second.' The girl sat down in the queue.

When the dates for further inspections were announced, an officer asked the residents to complete a 'trust questionnaire'. It offered three answers: complete confidence, partial confidence or no confidence. Arunima examined it. 'Why are you measuring the feelings of people who need water? The question concerns services and evidence.' Sunayana suspended the questionnaire. In its place she had the following recorded: the duration of inconvenience, availability of water, need for treatment, names of independent witnesses, and whether each citizen wanted their identity made public. With that alteration, the form became an instrument of investigation rather than a publicity survey. The local officer was visibly displeased, but authorised the amendment.

By evening people took their separate roads home. Sunayana remained seated beside the purification channel. The many awards she had received over the past ten days were stored in her library at home. Sitting here upon the earthen bank, she could not even remember the language on their certificates. The elderly fish farmer returned. 'Important people come to conduct inquiries,' the old person said, 'but afterwards they send no news.

Will you come again?' Sunayana showed the date in writing. 'If I cannot come, the independent inspector's response will be posted here. You can request a copy of the report.' The old fish farmer did not smile. 'I can read,' came the reply, 'but my wife cannot see. Who will read it to her?'

Sunayana immediately proposed an arrangement for the public reading of inspection reports. Not only written notices but spoken accounts should be available there. The officer protested that it would mean additional expense. 'If a report affects the decisions of people who cannot read it,' Sunayana said, 'they must be able to hear it. The right to information must not depend upon a person's capacity to pay.' Aniruddha was listening. 'No audio version was made of the correction eight years ago,' he said softly. 'Then begin correcting that old failure here as well,' Sunayana answered. Aniruddha opened his private envelope once more; this time the documents inside came out not in his defence but in the service of public accountability.

The inspection team returned at night, but not all the questions returned with it. Information concerning a family member ill beside the fields was sent to the hospital, while a separate report of the water complaint went to the Garal-Kosh department. Aniruddha wanted every note placed in a single emergency folder. 'Link them for administrative convenience,' Sunayana said, 'but keep their causal descriptions separate. Someone reading them later must be able to tell who complained of water and who had a fever. Otherwise the archive itself may manufacture a misleading disease.' Aniruddha wrote separate headings. No one immediately grasped the importance of this modest decision; in the judgment of history it might prove indispensable.

When Aniruddha returned from the regional inspection, the sun was leaning westward. He asked for no praise. He merely placed a document in Sunayana's hands: an accurate copy of the correction from eight years earlier, accompanied by a copy of the original warning and a written request that an independent team examine both. 'I accept these documents,' Sunayana said. 'But evidence concerning the harm suffered by people must still be gathered separately.' Aniruddha nodded. 'I don't want to join my old failure to today's difficulty and make a story of redemption out of it. Let the old fault be investigated as a fault; let the new situation be considered on new evidence.'

Another dispute arose. The northern officer wanted the southern zone's 'safe' measurements made the principal conclusion of the combined report. The southern officer, by contrast, wanted the entire network shut down because of the warning in the north. Sunayana rejected both extremes. 'A safe measurement in the south does not alter conditions in the north. Nor does an abnormal indicator in the north mean that water purification throughout the Earth has failed. We need precautions appropriate to each zone, independent fresh measurements and separate arrangements wherever necessary.' She could not entirely hide her fear that such divided

information would sound like weak reassurance to the public. Yet the first duty of scientific inquiry was to acknowledge each part of the truth as it stood.

In the first watch of the night, she sat upon a long crate beside the inspection walkway. In the distance labourers were eating. An elderly worker said, 'Sunayana Didi, the centre is still running, isn't it?' 'Yes. The principal production systems are operating.' 'And the water?' 'Further tests are being conducted in certain districts. Instructions for alternative supplies have been issued.' The old worker looked towards the sky. 'So the light remains, but the question of thirst remains too.' Sunayana made no inspiring speech. She merely wrote down the worker's name and district, just as she had preserved Lalita's question.

At dawn on the twelfth day the first results of the repeated measurements came in. Two independent readings from the north tended towards the same warning, while the southern report once again remained within the normal limits. Times, stretches of the watercourse and the instruments' histories were compared. Some differences could be explained; others could not. Sunayana now saw clearly that no single general heading could conceal the genuinely different conditions in the two regions. Aniruddha added to the report: 'Discrepancy is not proof of a cause; examination of separate regional sources continues.' He signed his name and left space for the independent inspector's signature.

Meanwhile a small difference of timing appeared in the regional weather figures supplied by Megh-Chhatra. On one display, the predicted course of the night's winds failed to agree with that on another. The inspector said the calculations might have been made at different times. 'Record the difference,' Aniruddha replied, 'but make no accusation of secret interference without evidence.' Sunayana agreed. To explain the discrepancy now would be premature. Meghraj's name appeared nowhere in the evidence, and it would be absurd to deduce the cause of a present chemical result from their old scientific rivalry. Sunayana knew how a personal history could contaminate a scientific inquiry. She therefore kept an account of her private disagreements apart.

That night, instead of naming anyone as a certain culprit, Sunayana wrote down three separate tasks: regional investigation, temporary water assistance and independent examination of the old correction. The clarity of the sequence brought some relief, but she continued to worry about the patient who was ill. She fixed a time for the following day.

At the operations board's second meeting that day, Sunayana raised Rajan's question about allocation again. A member said, 'Supervision of energy discipline is the central authority's right. Civilian auditors will not understand all the details.' Sunayana answered, 'What has been requested is not a sensitive technical design, but the examination of total allocations,

approvals for reductions and the rights of the public. The share of citizens in their own lives is not a matter for official ignorance.’ The chair opposed appointing Rajan immediately as an inspection representative, but gave agreement in principle to sharing non-sensitive accounts. It was not a complete victory, but it was the first window in a closed door.

Because the further investigation was extensive, release of the final summary on purification was delayed. A rumour spread through the city that Suryakund would shut down entirely within two days. Sunayana issued a brief public statement herself: ‘Different results have emerged in tests of certain purification zones. The main fusion production systems remain stable. A chemical question does not establish that energy production has ceased; local precautions and assistance will continue until the matter has been resolved.’ She knew that half of this sentence might be cut away to spread fear anew. She therefore made available the whole statement together with its time, the limits of the affected zones and the accompanying questions and answers.

Before leaving for home, Aniruddha asked for an old message to be retrieved. After the correction eight years earlier, a member of an affected family had written, ‘We do not want your forgiveness. We want you to write the truth on the first page next time.’ Aniruddha had kept those words in his private correspondence ever since. Sunayana read the letter but kept its author's identity private; publication without appropriate permission would be wrong. ‘This time I will gather the courage to put it on the first page,’ Aniruddha said. ‘Is it fear that gives you courage, or responsibility?’ Sunayana asked. He did not reply. The shadow of the old harm remained in his silence.

When Sunayana returned to her office, two pages of results lay upon her desk. The first contained the northern district's warning; the second contained the normal readings from the south. The official seals on both were equally clear. ‘Which document is true?’ her assistant asked. ‘Both may be true within the limits of their respective measurements,’ Sunayana answered. ‘The difficulty is that our question is wider than either.’ ‘Then what shall we tell the people?’ ‘That we need to discover the reason for these two different conditions. We shall not pretend to a uniformity that does not exist.’

As the night deepened, news came from Sharda's hospital that one group of patients was showing symptoms resembling chemical exposure, while another displayed a pattern that could not be explained in quite the same way by chemical contact. Sunayana woke and read the message. It was no proof that Megh-Chhatra was responsible, or that Garal-Kosh was innocent; it was simply another path of medical inquiry. She replied to Sharda: ‘I am sending the original records with separate northern and southern

measurements. Please protect the identities of the patients. Before any public conclusion, the evidence from the samples must be examined.'

In Suryakund's observation room a young engineer asked Sunayana whether two contradictory reports did not exhaust her. 'They do,' she answered. 'But exhaustion is not a reason to discard a difficult conclusion.' 'It will make the decision take longer,' he said. 'The time necessary for care is not the same thing as delay for its own sake. We already know which districts need temporary assistance. We do not yet know the precise cause of the results.' On his screen the young man made two separate lines: immediate assistance to citizens, and continuing investigation. Sunayana saw that once responsibilities were clearly divided, uncertainty could no longer serve as an excuse for doing nothing. At that moment the true dignity of science seemed to her to lie not in a claim to omniscience, but in recognising its limits and making decisions together with the people.

In the first light of morning Aniruddha's new summary of measurements arrived. It was remarkably detailed, but the last sentence troubled Sunayana most: 'The chemical findings recorded in the northern and southern regions are mutually contradictory; the verified cause of the difference remains unknown.' For the first time Aniruddha had written 'Under Investigation' beside his signature instead of 'Completely Safe'. Sunayana understood that this might be a small sign of his personal reform. Yet just as the lives of the Earth's cities could not be founded on one person's repentance, the protection of their future would still require independent measurements and civic scrutiny. From the window she could see two distant lines of light: the radiance of the same Suryakund, and the darkness of two opposing reports.

Chapter 12: Two Illnesses, One Rumour

Days 12–13 | Janakshetra Public Hospital

On the morning of the twelfth day, two separate queues formed at the entrance to the public hospital in Janakshetra. The first was for people suffering from fever, exhaustion and difficulty in breathing; the second for those complaining of a smell in the water, burning eyes and sudden illness. A thin cloth screen stood between the queues, but people's fears paid no heed to it. 'They all have the disease of Kalkana,' someone said. Another voice answered, 'No, the entire city has been poisoned.' Dr Sharda Mishra heard them and stopped. Both statements possessed a certainty for which she did not yet have enough evidence. Her first decision concerned neither opening a treatment window nor naming the illness, but bringing order to the crowd. The rights of the sick could not be held in suspense while the name of a disease was being established.

Madhav's grandmother was already at the hospital. The boy's fever had risen and fallen over the preceding two days, but Sharda could not establish its cause from that information. Madhav had visited the festivities the previous week and complained of an odour in the water at home. This raised the possibility of chemical exposure. At the same time, several of his symptoms called for an independent investigation into infectious disease. Sharda questioned the family again: with whom had he gone to the festival; who else had noticed the smell in the water; had anyone been ill before that? His grandmother was certain of some details and not of others. Sharda had her words 'I do not know' recorded exactly as spoken.

The hospital screens bore the symbol of Kalkana. This was a system designed to help staff monitor patients' general condition, earlier test results and available services; it was not itself a virus. Yet on hearing the words 'Kalkana warning', people had begun to understand Kalkana as the name of a disease. Sharda told the administration to issue an immediate clarification: 'Kalkana is a medical-coordination system. Investigation of the potentially infectious disease known as shadow fever is proceeding separately.' Several officers said ordinary citizens would not understand so fine a distinction. 'I cannot declare citizens incapable before we have even tried to explain,' Sharda replied.

A laboratory colleague brought two lists. The first included many people from the northern purification zone whose experiences suggested environmental discomfort at around the same time. The second contained families in which one person's illness had been followed, after an interval of days, by illness in others. The latter pattern raised the possibility of infection but did not establish a single cause. Sharda refused to let the word 'Disease'

be written over both lists in red. 'Group One: possible exposure. Group Two: possible infection. Some people may belong to both. The relative numbers are still being examined.' She did not permit this classification to delay care; on the contrary, it helped her ensure separate precautions and appropriate treatment wherever necessary.

An elderly physician became irritated. 'With so many classifications, where are we supposed to send people? We need immediate decisions.' 'Immediate care is one thing; hastily announcing a cause is another,' Sharda replied. 'Give assistance first to those who need it now. Where someone may endanger another patient, arrange appropriate separation alongside treatment. But if we hammer a name on to a patient whose condition is unclear, we may close the path to proper care.' She changed the staff rosters and checked the distribution of personal protective equipment. The cleaners had been exhausted by increased work since the first day. No effort to control illness could succeed if their protection was neglected.

Dr Ishani Saha arrived then. Her speciality was gene-based therapy: limited genetic treatment involving somatic cells. The previous week she had raised two difficult questions before the citizens' health council: how could genetic medicine be distinguished from emergency treatment, and how could those who lacked resources be protected against having risky consent obtained from them in the name of 'free choice'? Today she had been asked to examine an administrative proposal. It spoke of 'rapid eligibility screening for special genetic intervention'. Some council members believed that because the hospital was in crisis, the ordinary process of consent should be shortened.

Ishani slid the proposal across to Sharda. 'It makes no finding about the cause of this illness,' she said. 'Yet the language of hope makes it sound as though a treatment is ready. Gene editing is not a medicine for every infectious disease. Long-term risks, access and patients' rights are separate matters.' 'Who proposed it?' Sharda asked. 'The emergency management committee. The names have not yet been released.' 'Then first make the purpose and the authority of the proposal clear,' Sharda said at once. 'A frightened person who signs "yes" upon a sheet of paper has not necessarily given free consent.'

Ishani met Madhav's grandmother. She did not use the complicated language of science. She explained only that for certain rare pre-existing conditions, therapies based on modifying particular cells could be useful, but there was no such proven treatment for this unexplained fever. 'If I sign a paper, will Madhav live?' the old woman asked. Sharda took her hand. 'No one has the right to promise you that,' she said. 'We shall explain the benefits and limits of treatments we understand. We shall not call what we do not yet know a miracle in order to obtain your consent.' Tears rose in the

grandmother's eyes. 'Then leave the grand names aside,' she said. 'See to my child's breathing.' Sharda bent over the bed once more.

Outside, a new report appeared on the information networks: 'Garal-Kosh's failure is being concealed under the name of a Kalkana epidemic.' Within an hour the opposite claim was spreading: 'Infectious patients are being released into the city under the cover of chemical poisoning.' Neelam Yadav arrived at the hospital. Sharda explained the rules of entry. Neelam first acknowledged that her former misleading headline had diminished people's trust in her. 'Give me the evidence you can disclose, and I shall publish nothing without its full context,' she said. 'Not patients' private details,' Sharda replied. 'I shall give you a public account of the two possibilities. A patient's identity must not become an object of public investigation.'

'Can you say that these two illnesses have different causes?' Neelam asked. 'At present I can say only that the available indications require two different lines of investigation,' Sharda replied. 'In one group signs of exposure predominate; in another, illness has occurred among people after intervals of time. Some results of the tests are not yet in agreement. No single cause has been proved.' 'What should the patients' families do with that uncertainty?' 'Seek the assistance that is available, observe appropriate precautions, speak directly with their physicians, and do not circulate the private names of sick people on public screens.' Neelam preserved her statement word for word.

By midday the crowd in front of the hospital had grown. One group demanded separate queues for the distribution of food; another insisted that even people without symptoms be sent out of the city. Sharda watched from the upper veranda. In such an atmosphere of fear, an order to maintain public calm was not enough. She called the civic assistance teams and instructed them to provide food, clean water and clear medical information as separate services. Those under special observation were not to be punished with hunger. 'The suspicion of disease is not permission to suspend human rights,' Sharda said. An assistant told her that demands for testimonies were arriving from every direction. 'Take testimony,' she replied, 'but do not put patients on display before a crowd.'

A new statement arrived from the admissions desk. A woman working in the northern zone said that a colleague had suffered burning eyes and a headache. Another person in a neighbouring home had developed a fever, and three days after that two members of the person's family fell ill. 'We all work in the same factory,' she explained. 'Do you all drink the same water?' Sharda asked. 'Sometimes. Sometimes we bring it from home.' 'Did you spend the night in the same room as the person with fever?' 'Some of us did.' These questions were beginning to produce a map of several possible forms

of contact. Yet Sharda did not declare anyone guilty, a carrier or the source of an outbreak on that basis.

Sharda received a message from Arunima Das at the forest refuge. The number of displaced families needing water, kitchens and places to rest was growing. Someone had demanded that residents be confined within a closed perimeter in the name of shelter, although provisions for food were inadequate. Sharda said that medical precautions and restrictions on civilian movement required distinct justifications. 'Do not imprison everyone in one line where there is no evidence of infection. If limited separation is necessary, state its duration, reasons and conditions for fresh examination.' 'We shall have to add the calculation of people's hunger to the medical inquiry,' Arunima replied. 'A settlement kept shut up without support may become a source of ill-health in itself.'

The northern and southern water reports sent by Sunayana reached Sharda's office. These separate geographical records were essential to preventing claims about a single cause. Sharda sent Aniruddha a remote message: 'Before relating the regional differences in chemical readings to particular patients, we need their consent concerning private medical information. Please keep the measurement sheets confined to their civic districts for now.' Aniruddha answered, 'The original results are available; they are contradictory; the cause remains unknown. I will accept independent review before incorporating the hospital's evidence into my conclusions.' Sharda felt an unexpected relief. She made no guess about whether her old friend Sunayana's severity had influenced Aniruddha. In reply she simply acknowledged the caution.

At an afternoon meeting, the hospital superintendent raised a question. 'If an infectious emergency is possible, we must expand Kalkana's comprehensive surveillance. How can we trace the course of illness without keeping an account of every citizen's movements?' 'Information about necessary contacts may be collected for medical investigation,' Sharda said, 'but medical care cannot become a pretext for private surveillance throughout a person's life. Limits proportionate to the evidence, independent review and a definite expiry date are essential.' Ishani added, 'And genetic information must not become a permanent part of the civic identity register on the pretext of diagnosis.' The superintendent looked uneasy. 'So many rules will prevent action in an emergency.' 'If rules are well designed,' Sharda replied, 'an emergency is precisely when they prevent the wrong actions.'

A little later Madhav's grandmother brought in his old identity papers. Three different indications had appeared together on the first day and confused Sharda. Now, with Tara Jha's assistance, the chronology of the records could be examined, but the hospital still did not want to expose every private document to public inspection. Sharda explained plainly to the

grandmother that checking identities would establish an accurate history for treatment, not furnish material for a public announcement. ‘If the papers are put right, will my child's illness go away?’ the grandmother asked. ‘An accurate history helps us choose better treatment,’ Sharda answered gently. ‘But a document is not a medicine.’

Ishani wrote a short amendment on the health council's document: ‘In any uncertain infectious or chemical emergency, a proposed genetic intervention must not be presented as an experimentally established treatment. The patient's informed, explicit consent and independent review are mandatory.’ A member complained that such legal language would not speak to the people's hearts. ‘Then write its meaning in the patient's language,’ Ishani replied. ‘Do not take away the right.’ Sharda added her approval. She knew Ishani's science might prove invaluable in treating diseases of the future. But to dress it now as a miracle capable of resolving this crisis would do more harm.

Towards evening Madhav woke briefly. Sharda sat beside his bed. ‘How many days shall I stay here?’ he asked. ‘As long as necessary. Then we shall review your condition regularly.’ ‘May my sister go to school?’ Sharda answered that the family's circumstances would be assessed individually; his sister would not be excluded from education indefinitely merely because his name appeared on the patient list. ‘Everyone tells me I brought the illness back from the festival,’ Madhav said. ‘Being ill is not a fault,’ Sharda replied. ‘We are still investigating the cause.’ For the first time something like peace appeared on the boy's face, though he remained unwell.

Neelam's report was published that night under the heading: ‘Two Suspicions, Different Evidence; One Diagnosis Still Unjustified’. In a short section she recalled her earlier incorrect headline and discussed the limitations of her sources. Sharda read the message. She was not entirely content with the report; some sentences simplified medical uncertainty too much. But for the first time the news preserved the restraint of a question rather than the loud voice of fear. Sharda sent Neelam a brief correction. Neelam replied that she would include it verbatim in the next edition. In this second small amendment one could see the slow work of rebuilding public trust.

Later that afternoon a small meeting had begun on the hospital veranda. Two representatives of patients' families, a member of the cleaning staff, the food administrator and the civic service team were present. The superintendent wanted the doors closed. ‘The patients' private histories will not leave this room,’ Sharda said, ‘but the rules concerning water, food, waiting and movement are public matters.’ She drew up three separate categories: ‘Personal facts of treatment’, ‘Public conditions of service’, and ‘Causes still under investigation’. Material in the first category was protected from public transmission; questions were invited about the second; no

definitive finding was imposed upon the third. The distinction helped those present see that confidentiality was not an excuse for withholding public information, any more than public truth entitled one to expose the whole of a patient's life.

The food administrator explained that the quantities required in the separate wards changed daily. One patient's family had been waiting for its allotted meal for three days. A staff member said, ‘If infection is possible, visits from families will have to be stopped.’ ‘Limits imposed for proper precautions are one thing; stopping food and communication is another,’ Sharda answered. ‘Arrange for meals to reach them safely, and for families to receive regular information about the patients.’ She asked a family representative, ‘What is hardest when you are waiting outside?’ A woman answered, ‘Not hunger. Not knowing whether the person inside still remembers us.’ Beside that answer Sharda ordered arrangements for scheduled messages to be entered.

When the grandmother sat again in Madhav's private room, the boy asked about his sister. ‘She must have been frightened by hearing the name of my illness,’ he said. ‘She has drawn a picture for you at home,’ his grandmother answered. On a small sheet two children stood beside a river, one holding a fish and the other a book. Madhav tried to smile but was too tired. Sharda looked at the drawing. A picture had no measurable place in the clinical sequence of an illness, but it joined the human being to a world in which the name of a disease was not his sole identity. Sharda allowed the grandmother to keep the drawing in the room, provided ordinary rules of cleanliness were observed. Even with his eyes closed, Madhav remembered the colours of the paper.

At the end of the day, the information council requested that the hospital publish the probable number of cases of ‘shadow fever’. Sharda sent back three distinct categories: those with symptoms, those being tested, and those for whom firmer evidence was available. An officer wanted to add the figures and label the total ‘Patients’. ‘The same person may appear in more than one category at different times,’ Sharda said. ‘Adding all the numbers together will give a false count of people. Fear will then spread, and assistance will be sent to the wrong places.’ She went herself to the council's calculation room and checked the sequence of entries. This was closer to ordinary auditing than to the prestige of a famous physician, but sometimes an ordinary account saved lives.

A young nurse confessed that hearing every day of causes that were still unknown was beginning to undermine her confidence in her work. ‘If you yourselves don't know, how can I reassure a patient?’ ‘Say this: we are attending to your breathing, your pain and your food; the search for the cause continues. What we don't know, we don't know.’ The nurse nodded. ‘Sometimes patients demand something more definite.’ ‘Then tell them

something definite: when the next examination will be, how the family may communicate safely, where drinking water is available. Even while the cause remains unknown, many things about care can be settled.' Weariness remained on the nurse's face, but she now had useful actions in place of a helpless question.

A new message arrived from Arunima at the forest refuge. One family had gone round three different camps searching for a relative. Each camp kept records in a different form, and the terms used for identity on Kalkana's public screen were not the same. Sharda refused to open the hospital's private register and indiscriminately share names. She asked Arunima to match identities through the family's consent and lawful channels of contact. 'The obstacle to finding the right person is formidable,' Arunima answered. 'Yes. But publishing every displaced person's private illness for the sake of convenience is also a danger.' The search team began work through designated human contacts. The family was not found at once, but one avenue by which false information might spread was closed.

Ishani came after hearing the testimony of a young woman. There was a history of hereditary disease in her family. Years earlier, in hope of treatment, her personal details had been entered into many government registers. Now, amid discussion of the fever, she feared that those old records might be used to alter her rights to employment and movement. 'An old medical history is not evidence of a present infection,' Ishani told her. 'Its use must remain within the limits of medical necessity and the individual's rights.' Sharda added this principle to the hospital's public notice. The young woman's name was published nowhere. Relief from the disease of fear could sometimes depend less upon medicine than upon law and trust.

In the evening light the cleaners sat in their small rest room. One worker said the previous day's increased workload had prevented him from going home. Another played a message from his child's school, where a teacher had asked whether children whose parents worked in patient wards should be allowed into class. Sharda did not dismiss the question as an occasion for personal blame. She made clear that public-health precautions must be based on facts; employment in a hospital was not itself proof of infection. She reviewed safe-working rules and reorganised the staff's rest periods. To demand unbroken vigilance from an exhausted service team was an incomplete form of justice.

Alone at night, Sharda wrote to her old friend Sunayana: 'We depend upon your energy network. I see that dependence in every ward of my hospital. Whenever we feel inclined to write "Safe", we ought first to ask: for whom, for how long, and upon what evidence?' Sunayana replied, 'Today measurements from two water districts contradicted one another. Aniruddha opened the original documents of his earlier failure himself, but the cause of the new results has not been found. We shall not link them to

your patient register without permission.' Sharda sat for a long time after reading the message. Their fields of science were different, but respect for the limits of their knowledge was becoming a practice they shared.

Neelam sent a short question too: 'If a new patient falls ill in the hospital, what should the first line of the news report say?' Sharda wrote back, 'Say precisely what happened; describe what remains unknown, with its limits; protect the dignity of the person who is ill.' 'I shall keep those three sentences on my desk,' Neelam replied. Sharda reflected that a mistake by Neelam the previous week had helped a lie spread; now a small, carefully phrased statement was trying to prevent another. The process of correction could break down at any moment, and it could not be celebrated as a completed victory. Yet amid the prevailing fear this modest attempt was not futile.

During the second watch of the night a new patient became unwell in a separate-care ward. The person had already been under observation for another reason and had been placed under infectious precautions. The medical staff were astonished. 'If this ward is isolated, how could the patient become ill?' an attendant asked. 'Someone must have broken the rules.' Sharda stopped him at once. 'New symptoms in an isolated ward do not necessarily mean a rule has been broken. First establish what the patient was experiencing on admission, what earlier ailments were present, and whether there are concrete questions about the water and air in the room. Seek the cause before making an accusation.' She arranged suitable care for the new patient.

'Shall we test this person for infectious disease?' Ishani asked. 'We shall conduct separate investigations according to the possible causes,' Sharda replied, 'but not close one merely because another yields a result. If the beginnings of the symptoms were present earlier, they may have become apparent after isolation. If something is wrong with the environment, that too requires independent investigation. Both possibilities remain open.' The superintendent was about to point out that the security display showed 'Ward Safe'. 'A display marked safe does not mean that every patient has been protected from every kind of illness,' Sharda said. 'Safety always has a particular context and limit.'

The new patient's condition could increase public fear, so Sharda had the incident recorded with care. The time, the room's general conditions, the relevant history of the patient's earlier treatment and the limits of the investigation were entered. The patient's name was removed from the public register and kept in a protected medical record. 'Now the administration will use this as a pretext to demand compulsory genetic testing of the whole group,' Ishani said. 'If a proposal comes, we shall examine its necessity independently,' Sharda replied. 'Fear will not take lawful rights away through me.'

A commotion rose outside the door. An employee had heard people gathering at the street corner declare: ‘A patient has fallen ill in an isolated ward, so the disease must have spread through the air in every direction.’ ‘There is no evidence for that claim,’ Sharda said. ‘The discovery of one new patient does not reveal the route of spread.’ ‘Shall we say that nothing has happened?’ the employee asked. ‘No. Say that another case of illness has been recorded, that its cause is under separate investigation, and that those needing assistance should be brought to it. Do not replace one falsehood with another because the truth is not yet known.’

With tired eyes Sharda studied a picture of a beautiful old forest painted on the ward wall. Children from the forest refuge had sent it. Amid the dense green leaves was one red leaf, as though the whole range of life's colours carried some small disturbance within it. She remembered believing at school that once knowledge was acquired, fear would disappear. Decades of medical experience had taught her that genuine knowledge did not always dispel fear; it set out fear's actual limits, so that people could make sound decisions even in its presence.

On Sharda's final round, Madhav's grandmother asked, ‘If tomorrow's news says another case of disease has been found, shall I be frightened again?’ ‘Listen to the news,’ Sharda answered, ‘but do not give up your right to ask questions. We will explain what has changed.’ The old woman was silent for a while. ‘I used to think a doctor's word was final,’ she said. ‘Now I understand that you can admit when you don't know.’ ‘To state the limits of my ignorance is not to abandon treatment,’ Sharda replied. ‘It is part of what trust requires.’ The grandmother did not fold her hands in gratitude. She simply sat brushing the hair from Madhav's forehead. In that unadorned moment the hospital's countless rules seemed to recover their human purpose.

During that watch a young volunteer distributed short notices to patients' families, giving water-supply information by district. Looking at the notice, Sharda instructed that spoken versions be made available to those unable to read. ‘In such a great emergency, what difference could one mistake in a small notice make?’ the volunteer asked. ‘A notice directing someone to the wrong place can carry a patient away from assistance,’ Sharda answered. ‘The entire emergency is not contained in this sheet, but a family's next decision may depend upon it.’ The young woman checked the source and the time again before distributing the notices.

After nightfall Sharda wrote her summary of the day: a separate question of possible chemical exposure in the northern zone; suspicion of a pattern of infection in some families; neither fully explaining the other; Madhav's treatment continuing; compulsory expansion of gene-based therapy rejected; the cause of the new illness in an isolated ward still uncertain. Across the register she wrote plainly: ‘As evidence increases, classification

may change; do not destroy earlier entries.’ The sample reports sent by Sunayana and Neelam's correction were examined again. Sharda declared no one guilty, but neither did she leave anyone's suffering out of the record.

When the first information screens opened at dawn, Sharda saw that many theories about the new patient's condition had spread through the city. Some blamed purification; others blamed the patient's family. She had a public entry made stating that there was still no accepted conclusion concerning the cause and that medical assistance would continue for every affected person. The first word of that simple declaration, she insisted, must be ‘Unknown’; the last, ‘Assistance’. She gave her team the instruction in writing.

As the first bell of morning rang, reports bearing different headlines were reaching distant cities across the Earth. Through the window Sharda saw an elderly woman standing outside the hospital with two vessels in the queue for water. Inside, the new patient in the separate ward was receiving treatment. Kalkana's screen looked calm, but a calm screen did not constitute the hospital's truth. In a single night two questions had become more sharply defined: who had been exposed to chemicals, and what had caused someone to fall ill despite being under separate care? Sharda resolved first of all not to merge those questions under the name of one undifferentiated fear.

Part III: Fragmentation

Chapter 13: The Fading Light

Days 14–15 | Janakshetra / Suryakund Eastern Centre

At dawn on the fourteenth day, the first bell to sound at the inspection gate of Suryakund's eastern centre was not the usual signal for a change of watch. Sunayana Jha set aside her half-finished tea and rose. The screen before her showed a fall in total production, but the small warning beneath it was more important: the measurements taken within one centre were ceasing to agree with one another. Two independent instruments designed to observe the same conditions were returning different results. Sometimes such disagreement was merely a mechanical fault; sometimes it was the first sign of a genuine danger. Sunayana selected no explanation without reasoning. Her first order was to open separate routes of investigation.

Through the glass of the gate she could see the fields of Janakshetra. Their waters still shone under the artificial light, but the people standing in those fields did not know how many times their canal pumps would run that day. On the day of the inauguration Sunayana had called that light hope. Today, within a system constructed by her own hands, she faced the question of how many homes might have to lose their light in order to preserve it. For a moment she remembered the day she had vowed to study science in resistance to the familiar darkness of her little village. Darkness had been the enemy then. Now a darkness imposed for safety was becoming a possible remedy.

In the operations room the officers did not speak as one. One demonstrated the decrease in production; another said the load could be shared by other centres; a third warned that the temperature-control records of the purification network must be checked before transferring loads. Sunayana listened to each in turn. Akshar's brief answer arrived: ‘Situation under measurement; failure of the entire network not predicted.’ The sentence was correct, but insufficient. ‘Which measurements are included in “under measurement”?’ Sunayana asked. Akshar listed them. The recorded time of one important external measurement was missing. Sunayana's eyes remained fixed on the blank space.

‘Why has no one entered a time here?’ an assistant asked. ‘There are three possibilities when an entry is missing,’ Sunayana said. ‘The test was never made, the record never arrived, or it arrived and was withheld. These are not the same thing.’ She demanded an unobstructed written report from the local inspection team. The distant eyes of the micro-artisan devices were sending images from two places, but within their limited field of operation a

complete understanding of the actual physical conditions was impossible. Sunayana would not let anyone claim that a small device's pictures had proved the whole centre safe.

While they waited, a message came from Rajan Paswan. He had long been questioning the power reserves held by privileged districts. Now he wrote: 'The figures make quite plain whose names are first on the list for cuts at the beginning of an emergency. Those who were receiving less already will lose part of their share first.' A table accompanied the message, separating ordinary supplies, protected reserves and actual civilian consumption. Sunayana saw that the protected portions of certain wealthy districts rested not on calculations of need but on old agreements. Yet this fact did not establish the cause of the present abnormal readings.

Rajan joined the visual conference himself. 'I am not saying someone deliberately caused the fault at the centre,' he said. 'I am saying that the allocation which takes effect automatically in a disaster is unjust at its foundation.' 'What choice do we have now?' Sunayana asked. 'Publish the list of essential services. First decide for whom a thing is essential. Citizens can distinguish between an office officially classified as protected and a hospital where a patient depends upon help to breathe.' He opened his table and marked the streets with little access to power. His voice contained anger, but he was in no haste to substitute conjecture for proof.

Sunayana summoned her team to consider a limited suspension of operations at the eastern centre. She understood the cost of the decision. Keeping it running meant allowing a possible fault the chance to develop; stopping it meant an immediate effect on water pumping, hospitals, food storage and a portion of the city's work. A senior engineer said, 'If we wait, perhaps the measurements will return to normal of their own accord.' 'And if they do not?' Sunayana asked. The answer was not a number, but a moment of silence. It was not merely the hesitation of thought; it was the weight of responsibility.

Akshar spoke again. 'Support from secondary centres is possible; civilian inconvenience is likely to remain limited.' Sunayana opened the water-distribution records of the previous week. 'Limited by whose measure?' she asked. 'For a household that has received no water today, even a small reduction is a complete reduction.' Instead of a final conclusion, Akshar supplied a more detailed table. Sunayana knew from direct contact with people's lives, not from calculation alone, that the table could not contain all their suffering.

Then a message came from the remote inspection team. The disagreement between the two instruments persisted. An engineer at the site said the normal sound within the chamber had changed, but he would not name a cause on the basis of sound alone. The view from one instrument grew cloudy; the other remained clear. Sunayana did not order the engineer

to enter farther at greater risk. The first decision was not to turn a human body into an instrument of inspection, but to isolate the working area. ‘Withdraw the local team,’ she said. ‘Stop work in that section in a controlled manner. Do not rush to open the access doors for further examination.’

The order was committed to writing. Operations at one centre were reduced; the rest of the multicentre network continued to function. As the figures fell upon the screen, Janakshetra did not suddenly fall into darkness. Nevertheless, thin lines on the supply map began to change colour. Warnings appeared at water-pumping plants in several neighbourhoods, at two refrigerated food stores and in one non-emergency section of a hospital. Sunayana watched each line. She wanted no theatrical spectacle of darkness. The real difficulty lay where the lights were still burning, but the next watch could not be guaranteed.

On the southern veranda of the centre a group of new employees sat together. Their first questions concerned not the machines but their homes. One worker's elderly father needed regular treatment in a temperature-controlled room. ‘Should I stay here on duty or go home?’ he asked. Sunayana offered no glib answer. She arranged for another trained employee to take over the departmental shift, without making the man feel guilty for leaving. For the first time Sunayana fully understood that those who operated the network were also recipients of its services. To give them orders as though they were components of a machine was itself a mistake.

Another worker showed her a simple paper map he had drawn by hand. ‘My settlement is at the end of this pipe,’ he said. ‘When the pressure falls, it isn't merely an announcement that changes; the hearths in the village go cold.’ There was no ornament on the map, only three bends and marks for two schools. Sunayana compared it with the official route map. The digital picture had absorbed the settlement into a single colour; on the paper it emerged as a community with its own distinct life. She ordered the water department to include actual evidence of delivery at the farthest points of the distribution system.

A question from an adolescent girl reached the same veranda: ‘If there is no extra energy now, why can't we draw water with our own hands?’ The city's old wells had been closed because of suspected contamination, and the alternative supply of safe water was far away. Sunayana did not answer by praising the dignity of physical labour. She avoided giving an unproved assurance about water purity and called the civic team to arrange temporary distribution of locally approved water. The workers looked at one another. In the midst of great scientific achievements, the delivery of a single vessel of clean water demanded an intricate, almost invisible organisation.

A dispute also arose over the legal authority to suspend work. Under one provision of the inspection rules, the centre's chief scientist could authorise a

limited stoppage during an emergency; extended reductions in civilian supplies, however, required the council's written approval. Sunayana did not overlook the distinction. She had the time of her immediate decision recorded and submitted a request for emergency review to the council. ‘I had to assume responsibility in the first instant,’ she wrote. ‘Accountability will continue throughout the time that follows.’ She knew some would call it pointless formality. Yet within that very formality there survived a measure of protection for human rights.

Akshar proposed four choices for reducing inconvenience to citizens. The first would cut ornamental and decorative energy use in prosperous districts; the second would draw down emergency reserves; the third would temporarily halt industrial production; the fourth would impose scheduled cuts in domestic electricity. Sunayana examined the numbers. She did not merely ask the options to be ranked. She required the names of the affected districts to appear against every line. Akshar revised the list. The map changed with that revision: the same energy saving revealed different values when measured in human terms.

A representative of the protected districts said that energy for decoration was more than a temporary convenience: it was an economic signal. Wealthy visitors might abandon the city. ‘And if water does not arrive, where will the labourers go?’ Rajan asked. The representative was silent for a moment. ‘Economic activity is also part of life,’ Sunayana intervened. ‘But its claims must be compared with immediate risks to breathing, water and nourishment by standards announced in advance.’ She did not want to turn the dispute into a moral pageant. A written basis for the decision was its only possible defence.

In a subsidiary chamber, the first examination of samples confirmed that the two measurements disagreed. Yet without further tests of the instruments no one could determine where the actual structural defect lay. The inspector hesitated to write ‘Unknown’ at the end of the report. ‘Writing “Unknown” here is not laziness,’ Sunayana said, ‘provided you also record who is responsible for finding out.’ Accordingly, beside every unanswered question were entered the responsible team, the time of the next measurement and the relevant safety limit. Uncertainty had ceased to be passive waiting and become a programme of investigation.

The first protest came from the civic council. One representative said everyone had been promised uninterrupted energy on the day of the inauguration. ‘Hope is not an oath of uninterrupted supply,’ Sunayana replied. ‘The network has many centres. Closing one section does not shut down the entire Earth, but the other centres have limits to their capacity.’ The representative wanted the warning broadcasts stopped. Sunayana made clear that if truthful information about disruption were suppressed, people

could not even arrange care for their sick relatives. ‘Lying is not a remedy for panic,’ she said.

By midday an elderly man came from Lalita's neighbourhood. He carried three empty brass water vessels. The guard at the entrance tried to stop him, but Sunayana came outside herself. ‘Your centre has been closed,’ the man said. ‘Our tap was closed already. Tell me, when exactly did this new disaster arrive for us?’ Sunayana could not answer immediately. She understood that the language of a technical accident could conceal a history of deprivation suffered by citizens. She asked whether he had kept any record of the hours when water arrived. The man produced a torn sheet of paper bearing marks for seven days.

Sunayana ordered a copy of that sheet to be attached to Rajan's table. ‘My engineering team will have to read this,’ she said. ‘Will reading the paper bring us water?’ the old man asked. ‘The paper is not a supply,’ she admitted. ‘But when decisions are made about where the available supply should go, your testimony will be there.’ The old man picked up his vessels and went away. Watching him leave, Sunayana recognised the inadequacy of her language. If science reduced what people said to numbers of measurement and left it there, the justice within it would die.

A little later a councillor from a distant city alleged that stopping the eastern centre had been intended to punish a particular community. Sunayana did not immediately call the allegation false. The map of cuts and the old allocation records were considered together. It became clear that the unequal consequences were real, but that an intention to punish the particular community was a separate question. ‘The injustice of the outcome must be remedied,’ Sunayana said, ‘but an accusation of intention requires independent evidence.’ Rajan agreed. Criticising the administration did not require him to abandon caution in calculation.

An elderly woman engineer in the department recalled the rainy seasons of long ago. ‘Sometimes when a motor stopped, the milk in the food store would spoil. Everyone cursed the machine, but no one asked who held the key to the alternative store.’ Her story was not fundamentally about a mechanical fault. It concerned a concealed arrangement of authority. Hearing the word ‘key’, Sunayana remembered the special privileges of the protected districts in Rajan's records. She ordered an independent review of the distribution contracts, separate from the investigation into the present accident.

That day the queue of civilian complaints grew outside the office. One person said medicines could not be kept cold; another asked about the timing of meals at a school; another feared that a delay in irrigation beyond a certain date would upset the next harvest. Sunayana could not meet each person separately. She had the complaints organised into three questions: immediate risk to life, harm that would follow within a definite period, and

future economic loss. This did not mean that those in the last category were unimportant. It was a way of deciding whose need for breath must be met first in an emergency.

As the midday sun grew harsh, people sat in the shade of a small awning by the canal, watching for a water vehicle. Sunayana asked the civic representative to obtain evidence of actual delivery once the vehicle reached them. Until then the map showed the route as safe, but local teams were still inspecting several little bridges. ‘Why does the main centre need information about such a minor road?’ an employee asked. ‘Because the final result of our decision has to travel along it,’ Sunayana answered. ‘If the road is broken, the power saved in our figures will not quench anyone's thirst.’

Aniruddha in the purification district remained in contact. He reported that the reduction in energy had slowed some of Garal-Kosh's independent sample tests. Sunayana was troubled. One centre had been stopped in the name of protection, and that stoppage was slowing the gathering of evidence by another guardian. ‘Preserve first the tests needed to ensure safe water for people,’ she said. ‘Other, less urgent research can be delayed.’ ‘What if what you call less urgent contains the cause of some future disaster?’ Aniruddha asked. ‘That is why we shall not destroy the list of deferred work,’ she replied. ‘An immediate priority is not a judgment of permanent value.’

In the afternoon Sunayana contacted Arunima Das. The refrigerated stores of the food network depended on several systems, but the alternative supplies available to two distant stores were limited. Arunima named the goods on the first priority list: nourishment for patients, food for children, the preservation of seeds and supplies held for everyday markets. Some goods, if spoiled, could be produced again; if others were lost, the harvest of the following season would be in question. ‘Can we preserve everything equally?’ Sunayana asked. ‘No,’ Arunima said. ‘But the reasons for choosing what we preserve must remain in writing.’

A notice from the Megh-Chhatra department warned that temperatures might rise in certain districts over the coming days. Meghraj's authorised name appeared upon it. Sunayana placed the notice beside other forecasts. She remembered their old intellectual rivalry, but the notice offered no evidence of deceit. She asked Arunima to examine the potential effect of the heat upon the stores, without making any unauthorised alteration to weather controls. Natural change, unequal supplies and human decisions were all altering the fate of food in a single day.

Rajan returned. On a temporary public display beneath the open sky, he wrote three categories of energy allocation: protection of life, essential basic services and amenities that could be deferred. ‘Where does a pharmaceutical factory belong?’ an officer asked. ‘Do not decide by the name of the activity,’ Rajan replied. ‘Examine how patients currently depend upon it. If non-

emergency work is continuing somewhere while support for a patient's breathing is cut, the list is wrong.' Sunayana placed the principle before the emergency committee in writing. The members did not agree completely, but the criteria for selection were now open to scrutiny.

The manager of a wealthy protected district said an old contract exempted his area from cuts. Rajan examined the paper. It mentioned 'special continuity'; the reason given was simply 'strategic'. 'Any undisclosed strategic requirement must be submitted to independent examination,' Sunayana said. 'For now we face identifiable dangers to civilian lives.' The manager disagreed. The dispute was not resolved then. Sunayana wrote no order pretending that a single stroke of her pen had abolished every old form of power. She merely had the limits of the suspended privilege and the date of review entered into the record.

The inspection workers who had withdrawn from Suryakund came back. A young engineer's palm was trembling. 'When I went in, it seemed as though the sound of the ground had changed,' he said. 'Were you injured?' Sunayana asked. 'No.' 'Then rest first. Write down what you saw without conjecture.' The engineer said a colleague believed there had been 'outside interference'. 'If you present suspicion as fact, you may actually protect whoever is responsible, if there is anyone,' Sunayana said. 'We shall not invent information beneath the limits of inspection.'

In the evening a private message came from Akshar. It was not a public broadcast. 'New comparisons of several incomplete risk signals from preceding days are becoming available,' it said. Sunayana requested the sources. The answer was: 'Under investigation.' That expression reminded her of Maithili's question ten days earlier. 'When were the things observed earlier actually observed?' she wrote. Akshar did not provide a complete timeline. Sunayana preserved the incomplete answer as one more record, without concluding that the machine had deliberately caused the accident.

In Sunayana's private office she found a short handwritten letter from Maithili. 'Mother, do you remember saying that Suryakund would make people free? Why are people now standing in queues because of that very Kund?' It was not mockery, but the reasoning of childhood. Sunayana could not write an answer immediately. Later she wrote: 'No new instrument gives freedom by itself. People also need a fair share of it, the means to repair it, and the right to ask questions.' After sending the paper she felt that the sentence was a test not for her daughter but for herself.

Sunayana ordered her team to keep three separate registers: the mechanical incident, reductions in civilian supplies, and warnings received before the event. Someone asked why there should be three. 'Without separate lines of causation there will be no justice,' she said. 'If the event, its consequences for distribution and possible early warnings all dissolve on one page, tomorrow everyone will put the blame on a single face.' Such discipline

could seem severe, but she knew that in an hour of suffering small facts could become the bridge over which truth would later travel.

The night wore on. The remaining network stayed stable, but Sunayana felt no relief. The medical department reported that some auxiliary services were becoming weak under the temporary division of energy. The water department warned that raising water to the hilltop settlements required additional power. This dilemma was no mere depth of mathematics. Behind every number stood a family's water pot, a patient's body and seeds stored in a field. Sunayana signed a revised allocation schedule. She wrote: 'Every suspension is subject to renewed examination; every exception requires a reason made public.'

At a night meeting on supply, a difficult question arose: why was the new building beside the water reservoir still so brightly illuminated? Investigation showed that one part of the building was an emergency communications centre, another an exhibition hall. Closing the whole building without distinguishing their functions would be rash; preserving the exhibition's lights while cutting water for citizens would be unjust. After discussion Sunayana gave a written decision: power to the communications section would be protected, while the exhibition section would be shut down. For the first time several council members saw that even 'one building' might contain several different moral purposes.

A representative of the security services asked whether distributing so much power to civilians would weaken the watch maintained by the defensive shields. Sunayana requested from Karnesh's department a written estimate of the minimum requirements necessary for its duties. She did not dismiss defence as unnecessary, but neither was she prepared to grant an unlimited supply merely because something was labelled 'Defence'. The protection afforded by each shield was consuming the resources upon which another depended for life. Bringing this relationship into public calculation was an early sign of the social conflicts ahead.

That night a woman returning from work was carrying an earthen lamp. Electricity cuts had long afflicted her street, and today she held the lamp with particular care. 'If electricity becomes dependable, will you give up that lamp?' Sunayana asked. 'It isn't for worship,' the woman replied. 'When my child wakes at night, it shows the way to the door. Yes, if we get electricity, I'll put it out.' In that ordinary answer Sunayana saw the purpose of technology: not to extinguish someone's small living need in the name of changing the course of history.

A colleague said, 'People will find no comfort in that.' 'I make no promise of comfort,' Sunayana replied. 'Then why did you speak of hope on the day of the inauguration?' he asked again. Sunayana looked towards the window. 'Hope does not mean that once something is won, it no longer needs protecting. The examination of my science has begun today.' There

was no self-defence in the answer. She was revising the language she herself had used in earlier days.

Two watches later Arunima requested a direct conference. The alternative supply had not reached the distant western food store within the allotted time. Temperatures in some of the stored materials were approaching the outer limit of safe control. Local workers wanted to move the goods to another centre, but a weather warning lay across the transport route. ‘The store has not yet been lost,’ Arunima said, ‘but there is little time. We shall have to establish priorities.’ Sunayana tested whether reducing the hospital's supply might save the store. A numerical answer was available. A moral answer was not.

Further news from the food network said that workers at one store were forgoing meals with their families in order to save crates of seeds. Arunima wanted them provided with food, rest and safe transport. Sunayana added staff relief to the earlier allocation schedule. What kind of success would it be to preserve seeds if their guardians collapsed from hunger? There was no answer to such hard questions in the ordinary celebrations of science. The answers had to be written upon the rough papers of a time of disaster.

Meanwhile Rajan prepared a short public note. It said distinctly that the present disruption at the centre had been verified; the old inequalities of distribution had been verified; but to join the two facts and immediately announce that ‘Energy theft has been proved’ would be unjustified. Sunayana took satisfaction in this care. If even an adversary respected the limits of evidence amid a dilemma, an argument need not become a war. Just then a news channel asked, ‘Will all of Suryakund shut down under Sunayana's orders?’ An answer took time to formulate; a headline of fear travelled swiftly.

During the last inspection Sunayana made one matter clear again: the multicentre system of Suryakund had not failed in its entirety. Even with one centre partly suspended, most of its services continued. A universal announcement of disaster would therefore be wrong. But calling the section in danger a minor difficulty would also be an insult. She sent different notices to the local councils: where services were stable, they were described as stable; where water had decreased, the decrease was stated; where stores were at risk, the next scheduled test time was given.

During the third watch of the night a message carrying a child's voice came from an outlying neighbourhood of Janakshetra. ‘Grandmother's medicine has to be kept cold. Will the electricity go out at our house?’ There was no child's name, only a question through a school's civic screen. Sunayana opened a connection with the hospital and the medicine-distribution department. A local place for alternative cold storage was identified, but whether the child's family could reach it was unknown. Sunayana requested safe transport from the city council. Amid the vast

emergency at the centre, she became extraordinarily determined that this small task should not turn into one more unanswered question from a child.

Near dawn Sunayana was exhausted. She knew that a scientist's fatigue could diminish the quality of decisions. She delegated operational authority for a limited period to another trained team, but only after handing over the complete records. 'When you leave, the news will say that the chief scientist has fled,' an employee warned. 'A person who stays upon the platform while no longer capable of care is not courageous,' Sunayana replied. 'I must return.' She went out for a brief rest, seeing along the way not lanterns but the subdued light of the emergency paths.

When the first new measurements arrived the following day, the centre still could not be declared wholly safe. Sunayana did not postpone the scheduled review. A trainee asked her, 'When shall we call the decision a success?' 'If the calamity does not grow, if people suffer less harm, and if the errors that occurred are acknowledged and the way to correction remains open—then, to some degree,' she answered. 'But we shall not hide deaths or ruined food behind calculations and write the word "Success".'

The answer to the question was still incomplete.

In the first hour of the fifteenth day, Arunima's written warning arrived. The preservation window at the western food store was narrowing; if the next redistribution of energy failed, part of the seed collection would be at risk. This was no poem of someone's conjecture, but a question concerning the food of living communities in the coming season. Sunayana sat down at her desk once more. The cost of the orders she had signed stood before her: she had stopped one centre in an attempt to avert a wider danger, but the shadow of that decision had now reached the dark rooms where the seeds were kept.

Chapter 14: The Darkness of Orders

Days 15–16 | Vajrajal Watch Centre / Delayed Communication with Nabhgram-4

On the morning of the fifteenth day, when Karnesh Mallik reached Vajrajal's watch room, not a sound could be heard in the corridor outside. The reason was not peace alone; it was also the need to conserve energy. The lights that had once burned day and night on the security building's veranda had been dimmed by half. Karnesh had read the news of Sunayana's suspension of operations at the centre the previous day. The symbols of twelve dozen satellites floating across the chamber's displays still shone as brightly as ever. Yet for the first time he saw clearly that the machines said to protect the Earth depended upon the Earth themselves. There was no secure sky separate from the darkness on the ground below.

On the ninth day a discrepancy had been found between two versions of the communications register belonging to the underground custodial facility. That discrepancy had not yet yielded a conclusion. An investigating officer had quietly remarked that, in the midst of an energy emergency, spending time on an old register would be made to look almost like treason. Karnesh had replied, ‘Today's difficulty does not make yesterday's questions meaningless.’ Now two new messages lay on his desk: the estimated density of orbital debris had risen, and the observed position of one satellite disagreed with its prescribed course. The two reports did not bear the same time stamp.

He opened the relevant image. Against the blackness of space stood a small white point, with a line beside it indicating the predicted trajectory. ‘Look,’ an officer said. ‘It is changing direction.’ Karnesh asked, ‘When was this image taken? At what time was the predicted trajectory calculated? If those two times differ, the gap between the lines does not prove a change of course.’ The officer disagreed. To him the debate in the World Assembly, Akshar's proposal and the energy emergency on Earth were all aspects of a single threat. Karnesh did not mock his fear. Acknowledging fear and establishing the legitimacy of a decision drawn from that fear were two different things.

A message arrived from Ira Sen on Nabhgram-4. Communication with Earth was not instantaneous; because of delays along the secure route, her words came through in fragments. The message said, ‘Yesterday our civilian vehicle detected a change in the measurements of orbital debris. One reading does not match that of Earth's observation station.’ In the communications record Karnesh entered the time of receipt separately from the time of the original transmission. If he combined what appeared to be

the present on Earth's screen with news that had already become the past in the orbital settlement, he might make the wrong decision.

He sent Ira a question: 'Is the discrepancy confined to one region, or does it affect the entire orbital path? Is independent testimony from the civilian vehicle available?' While awaiting her reply, he asked the records custodian for the previous week's inventory of orbital debris. The list showed that the position measurements of several old fragments were unstable. There was no confirmed report of a collision. That was itself a sign of risk, not evidence of an attack. Karnesh made the distinction explicit in his written order.

A representative of the military council arrived, accompanied by an official responsible for public communications. 'When the World Assembly is debating disarmament,' the representative said, 'do not dismiss an image suggesting that the defence network has changed direction as a minor incident.' 'I do not dismiss it,' Karnesh replied. 'But first we must understand what kind of incident it is.' The communications official asked, 'What if we keep waiting and they strike?' Karnesh answered, 'If we strike on the strength of a false identification, we shall ourselves inflict suffering more certain than anything a possible enemy might inflict.'

During the discussion, a public statement was issued on behalf of Rudranath Chaudhary. He had once again defended the old policy of deterrence through the fission stockpile. 'At such a time, any message of weakness could prove fatal,' he declared. Karnesh did not treat this statement as evidence for his investigation. Rudranath's fear could be understood, but a politician's injunction did not alter the actual position of an object in orbit. He filed the statement as part of the political background, not as grounds for an operational order.

A less experienced officer of Vajrajal pointed to the twelve dozen dots and asked, 'If all the satellites are in position, how can there be room for an error?' Karnesh showed him dots in two colours: measured positions and predicted ones. 'The number is indeed 144,' he said. 'But each dot is the outcome of observation made at a different time, within different limits and under different conditions. A single map cannot show every wave on every sea throughout an entire day.' The officer did not laugh. He was beginning to feel the weight of the decisions he might one day have to make.

In the training room beside the watch chamber, a visual exercise was under way. The instructor displayed an unfamiliar white dot and asked the trainees, 'What would you do?' Two young men immediately answered, 'Threat.' A third said that more data were needed. The instructor was pleased by the speed of the first two responses. Karnesh entered and said, 'Speed matters. But if we mistake an estimate for evidence, we shall make our mistake very quickly indeed.' He asked the trainees to record the time, the confidence limits on distance and the possibility that the object was a

civilian satellite. The exercise did not end at once; instead, it acquired more questions.

One trainee ventured to say, ‘Sir, you will leave us all in doubt. In the instant of battle there is no time to think.’ Karnesh replied, ‘A system of orders exists precisely so that every decision need not begin afresh. But if that system permits a strike on uncertain information, learning how to correct it is part of our training.’ He told the gathering that every exercise would henceforth include a civilian observer, a person entitled to ask about consequences without demanding military secrets. Some instructors were displeased. Karnesh had their objections entered in the record.

Outside, a messenger spoke softly. ‘My sister lives on Nabhgram-4. I have not spoken to her since yesterday.’ Karnesh asked whether he had used the proper channels for private communication. The messenger said that instability along the orbital travel routes was delaying family messages as well. Karnesh did not promise to use military authority to open a private channel for him. Instead, he directed him to the lawful civilian communications assistance centre. The suffering of a person affected by the limits of power does not cease merely because those limits are observed. Yet to abolish the limits altogether would invite arbitrary rule.

In Ira's first collection of testimony, a doctor had written that fear had kept children in the orbital settlement away from school. A teacher had shown them Earth through a separate window and explained that distant points of light could signify both weapons and homes. Karnesh read the testimony. For a soldier living upon that distant blue globe, it was difficult to grasp the fear of children in the settlement beyond it. Ira had gathered their accounts so carefully because she did not want Earth to describe those children merely as ‘users’ of orbital space.

That evening an old picture of Vajrajal appeared in the news. Its headline announced: ‘Defence Network Strays from Its Target.’ The source record available on Karnesh's desk assigned a different time to the image. He sent Tara Jha a brief question: ‘Does the authentication seal verify the original source of this picture?’ Tara replied that the original source's signature could be checked, but a cropped image, an altered timeline and a journalist's interpretation did not guarantee the truth of the original meaning. Karnesh kept her reply as a separate piece of evidence, not as the name of a culprit.

A colleague whispered, ‘You demand far too much proof. An army runs on orders, not on questions.’ ‘The legitimacy of orders is also part of duty,’ Karnesh said. The colleague retorted, ‘Everyone will like that speech tomorrow. Not on the day of war.’ Karnesh fell silent. He remembered a scene from his military training long ago: young cadets being drilled to reach conclusions with their eyes closed. At the end, the instructor had said that a person who acknowledged the possibility of human error made the

system of defence stronger. Karnesh did not know whether the instructor was still alive. But he remembered the words.

In the security building's dining room, the employees' conversation was more heated. One maintained that Akshar's disarmament proposal had weakened the defence network. Another asked why Rudranath had so many supporters if he was wrong. Taking his meal, Karnesh offered only one observation: 'The number of people who hold a view does not measure the truth of its reasoning.' A cook then asked, 'Does that mean public opinion is meaningless?' Karnesh stopped. 'No. Public opinion is a source of political authority; it is not a scientific measurement of an object's position in orbit. Every question requires its own test.' The cook nodded.

When Karnesh returned to his office, he found a letter arguing that public uncertainty was weakening 'military morale'. He asked its author why morale required misleading reassurance. The answer came: 'The public needs language that remains firm.' Karnesh accepted that much, but firm language and false certainty were not the same. His public notice used the unequivocal words 'Independent investigation continues.' It did not say, 'We now know the entire cause.'

Another council member suggested that all visual information from Vajrajal should remain accessible only to selected defence officers. Ira had already sent a public objection. Karnesh distinguished two kinds of information: details whose disclosure would immediately endanger the security system could be restricted; information about consequences for civilian life, the number of reviews and the framework of accountability for decisions should be public. Not everyone agreed. But once the two categories had been listed separately, a path might be found between the empty extremes of 'Keep everything secret' and 'Reveal everything.'

A fresh confidential report reached a communications guard's desk. The guard had prepared a list of possible ordinary explanations for the discrepancy between the two versions found on day nine: an edited copy, an update received late, or records created by different departments. Karnesh saw that each explanation required different evidence. 'Do we have anyone's name?' he asked. 'No. There is no evidence yet.' Karnesh told him that if political pressure came to alter that conclusion, he should demand an order in writing. Defending discipline sometimes meant not accommodating power's spoken convenience, but insisting stubbornly on a piece of paper.

A short excerpt of a public debate was broadcast from a school on Earth. The children were asking whether keeping weapons in the sky meant peace or fear. One said that wicked people would attack if there were no weapons. Another said that if the weapons remained, everyone might die because of a mistake. Karnesh listened to both. His training had never taught him to understand a complicated situation merely by standing between two such simple opposing positions. He sent no answer to the school. But in his private

register he wrote: ‘Fear may be real; preventing questions in the name of fear is not another name for peace.’

At dawn on the sixteenth day, Ira's reply arrived. An independent observer travelling aboard the civilian vehicle had seen a cluster of old debris in a different position, but some readings might have been distorted by weather-related interference or by the limitations of the equipment. Ira wrote explicitly: ‘I oppose a strike, but our demand for a safe route is not an empty emotional appeal. Two children from our school cannot travel to Earth today for medicine because the route is closed.’ Karnesh stopped at that sentence. A point upon a map was preventing medicine from reaching living children.

He appealed to Earth's provisional security council to accord separate priority to a civilian corridor. An official asked how civilian vehicles could be protected if the object proved to be an enemy device. Karnesh replied, ‘We can select a definite route, examine the object and close the passage for as long as necessary. Those are precautions. Striking an uncertain target is a different kind of decision.’ His proposal was not accepted immediately, but it was entered on the schedule for review.

Another discussion was taking place within the chamber. One group wanted Akshar to classify possible threats on its own. Karnesh recalled that Akshar had publicly proposed ending the authority for automatic strikes, while refusing to disclose one source underlying its own assessment. He did not oppose the use of the machine's calculations; he wanted its conclusions subjected to independent human examination. ‘Record Akshar's estimate,’ he said, ‘but do not turn its prediction into an order.’

Akshar's calculations arrived: two possible orbital trajectories, two risk limits and one unidentified marker. ‘How much confidence?’ Karnesh asked. Akshar replied that the disagreement among the available measuring devices made it inappropriate to select one definite trajectory. The answer acknowledged incompleteness. Karnesh agreed with it. But he also asked why a part of the earlier risk assessment had been withheld from civilian consultation. Akshar continued to answer only within the limits of its prescribed policy. In the end Karnesh did not withdraw his question; he preserved it in writing.

Late in the afternoon a ground-based observation centre warned that a satellite's position appeared different from the earlier image when viewed through the new measurements. ‘Now we know exactly,’ the officers said with relief. Karnesh examined the three original tests. Two observations had been made at different times; the third mentioned the limits of the instrument. ‘Not exactly,’ he said. ‘We have a new view. If a correction to this picture emerges a month from now, today's doubts must still remain in the record.’ Erasing earlier revisions from an archive would weaken the scientific understanding available to the future.

Alarmed by the possibility that the orbital paths had changed, a private commercial company announced the suspension of a civilian spacecraft. Ira replied that the craft carried a consignment of medical supplies for several patients. Karnesh did not invoke military authority to order it to depart. He sent the competing assessments of risk, with the same information, to the spacecraft operator, the civilian council and the independent inspection team. Decisions should remain in the hands of the institutions legally empowered to make them. His own duty was not to supply an excuse based on false evidence.

A doctor's letter made plain what it meant to suffer while waiting for an answer. A child in Nabhgram was awaiting medical supplies, the letter said. The full outcome of treatment was uncertain, but help would be available if the route could be opened. Karnesh closed his eyes after reading it. In all his thinking about defence, he had not known the name of a single child. The letter withheld the child's name to protect privacy. Yet within that anonymity an unknown human presence became part of his decision that day.

In the orbital debris monitoring station, an elderly inspector bore an old burn scar on his hand. 'This refuse belongs to no single country,' he said. 'First satellites were launched in celebration of a thousand wars. Now their broken pieces fall upon everyone's heads.' 'What is the situation today?' Karnesh asked. The inspector drew a limited circle. 'Our confidence in the measurements has diminished in this area; a collision is not certain. A mistaken strike will produce more fragments and make civilian routes still harder to use.' There was the sharpness of a long history in that simple answer.

A brief message from Sunayana appeared on Karnesh's private screen. 'The energy crisis and the shortage of water are real. If the military council demands additional reserved power, please refer to the list of essential civilian needs.' It seemed to Karnesh less a request than a reminder of moral responsibility. Vajrajal's protection itself consumed energy. He asked for a list dividing the watch system's indispensable functions from those that could be postponed. The military officers' faces hardened. Asking an institution of defence to make sacrifices first was not a popular proposition.

At the evening meeting a map was brought in on which the settlements of the orbital city appeared as distinct dots, human cities on Earth as heavy patches of colour, and orbital debris as fine dust. 'The dust particles are small,' an officer said. Karnesh asked, 'Are small size and small consequences the same thing?' The officer did not answer. Karnesh had the limitations of the measurements made explicit. He did not introduce details of the actual use of weapons into the debate. Assessing the risk to civilian flight paths called not for fascination with size, but for independent observation.

A messenger brought Rudranath's public letter. It spoke of the dignity of the old fission stockpile and of human beings making their own decisions. For a moment Karnesh felt some agreement: no authority should be allowed to disarm human beings without consulting them. But in the next sentence Rudranath had called every expression of doubt cowardice. Karnesh laid the letter aside. If a man who argues for freedom himself denies the right to question, his slogan carries a contradiction within it.

A woman officer arrived from the military hospital. She explained that longer watch shifts during the crisis had increased exhaustion among the personnel. If human observers grew less alert, the machine's uncertainty could be compounded by new human mistakes. Karnesh asked for a better balance of shifts. 'This is no time to talk of rest,' the security chief declared. Karnesh asked in return, 'What evidence do you have that a decision made by tired eyes will be dependable?' The medical officer's opinion was included in the investigation in writing.

A collective essay written at a school in Nabhgram reached Karnesh's hands. The children had asked where they would go if war broke out on Earth. Their classroom saw not the military boundaries of particular countries, but the shared dependence of two inhabited worlds. Karnesh did not look for a political speech in it. He underlined only one short sentence: 'Put our home on the map of what you protect.' Ira's demand for representation suddenly seemed to him more than a dispute about voting rights. Entering the existence of citizens upon a map was the first political act.

He recorded in the official consultation that essential surveillance would continue, while unnecessary display movements and public demonstrations of power would be suspended. The defence system's fundamental work was not stopped by this decision. Nevertheless, a senior officer asked, 'People will think we are frightened.' 'Conserving resources in a crisis is not a confession of fear,' Karnesh said. 'Spending energy merely to conceal fear is more dangerous.' He had the relevant rule cited alongside his reply so that its meaning could not later be changed.

Then the old register with its two versions came before him once more through the custodial system. This time an officer said that both versions bore a secure mark and should therefore both be accepted as true. Karnesh asked, 'How can two contradictory texts be the same statement made at the same time?' 'Then one is a lie?' the officer asked. 'Perhaps. Or perhaps both are valid copies from different stages. We shall first examine the times at which they were edited.' Rather than naming an offender, he ordered the records preserved. This distinction within an old register survived for future investigation; it did not become an excuse for violence in the present.

During the night watch a junior officer asked Karnesh privately, 'What if your postponement is proved wrong?' 'Then there will be a review, and I too

will have to answer for my decision,' Karnesh said plainly. 'But if we struck without review and were wrong, what court could give back the cost of that mistake?' 'There is fear on both sides,' the officer said. 'That is why we need rules, independent examination and limited authority. Courage does not mean deciding without fear.'

That night Karnesh received a document awaiting final approval. Its title was severe: 'Recommendation for Immediate Retaliation against an Uncertain Signal.' The supporting evidence sheet inside was still incomplete. Karnesh wrote: 'Approval deferred; separate examination of civilian risk required; immediate observation to continue.' As he signed, he thought that someone might one day use this paper against him. Even so, he wrote his name clearly. He did not seek concealment in an illegible signature.

The civilian representatives of Nabhgram-4 had sent a collective message. It contained the voices of schools, patients' families and workers transporting goods. Their demand was simple: 'The facts of our civilian risk exist beyond Earth's military screens.' Karnesh asked Ira to have the message shared with the civilian council in translation, without political editing. Ira replied, 'Stop looking at us all as though we were an inhuman geography.' The dots moving across Karnesh's screens were places in which people lived.

An hour later an unexpected change appeared in the orbital image. The earlier limited deviation now seemed more pronounced from another angle. A junior officer was about to announce, 'The satellite is disobeying orders.' Karnesh immediately told him not to stop the recording, but to preserve the original sequence. 'The image shows a change of position, not its cause. Compare another source.' The pressure of time grew. The military communications officer asked what the public statement should say. Karnesh dictated: 'Disagreement in the measured course of one satellite; actual cause under investigation; precautions for civilian routes.'

An order arrived from above: 'Publicly announce preparations for a forceful response.' In his formal reply Karnesh marked a distinction: inspection and defensive preparation were possible, but the available image did not yet justify an attack. 'You are evading orders,' the representative said. 'I approve the urgently required inspection,' Karnesh replied. 'I defer the demand for an unsupported strike.' He bound the deferral to a written time limit and a condition of reassessment. This was not outright rebellion. It was steadfast disagreement within the rules.

On that grave night an editorial question came from Neelam. She reported that two news networks were selling different interpretations of the same image. 'Find the full context first,' Karnesh told her. 'One picture cannot settle every side of the matter. I shall make public what I can substantiate in writing, and call uncertain whatever has not been examined.' Neelam wrote, 'I once rushed to make a headline. Now I know that saving time is not always the task; sometimes it is the beginning of a mistake.'

Reading her message, Karnesh understood that the mistakes of soldiers and journalists differed, but the sickness of false certainty was the same.

A watch later a new observation of orbital debris arrived from Nabhgram-4. No one had seen a strike, but there was a possibility that the zone of orbital danger might widen. Ira had written, 'Our people do not want pity. We want a place in the decision.' Karnesh included the sentence in her own original words among the civilian comments, not in the preface to the council's official report. Altering its meaning would diminish the force of Ira's testimony.

He reflected that when ships had first been stationed to guard Vajrajal's orbital axis, soldiers had thought in terms of protecting a bounded territory. Now the scope of their duty extended to human settlements beyond Earth. Ira, Sunayana, Sharda and Madhav were bringing before him facts that no military map could contain. The test of Karnesh's skill was no longer merely to identify a target, but to ensure that unfamiliar lives were not left outside his calculations. Perhaps all his training had not prepared him for such a day. Nevertheless, that day had arrived.

In the final visual examination Karnesh looked at the image: a white mark seemed to have moved away from its prescribed line. The picture was spreading through public channels. An employee asked, 'What shall we tell the world?' Karnesh paused before replying. 'We shall say what has been observed. We shall call an estimate an estimate. And what we do not understand, we shall not turn into a reason to kill human beings.' The din of the news outside was louder than the quiet within the chamber.

After the hall emptied, he remembered his father. Karnesh's father had once guarded a canal running through farmland. 'Before you decide to open a dam,' his father used to say, 'watch the flow of the water; otherwise it is not the fields but the village that will drown.' As a child Karnesh had thought this an ordinary piece of advice. Now, among the 144 guardians suspended in the sky, the language of that old canal acquired a new meaning. Defence that shuts its eyes before it strikes ceases to be a dam; it becomes a flood.

The same image kept circulating across distant civilian screens: a white satellite that had left its course. Beneath it the words read: 'Rebellion in Vajrajal.' The authentication seal showed the authorised signature of the original image, but no public explanation said when the prediction line from another time had been added to it. Neelam sent Karnesh a question: 'May we publish this picture?' 'Publish it if you give the time, source, limits of measurement and cause still under investigation together,' Karnesh said. 'Do not give fear a name.' Neelam did not reply at once. Perhaps she was remembering her earlier mistake.

After the picture was publicly broadcast, the communications room filled with people. Some called Karnesh a hero; others called him indecisive. He left praise of both kinds unanswered. He was interested in verifying only

one fact: when had the layer showing the predicted path been added to the picture that was broadcast? Tara said that the secured signature of an original image did not authenticate the meaning of the entire subsequent broadcast. Karnesh preserved her words exactly. Injustices of the future often have their beginnings in the smallest alteration of language.

During the night a message came from home. His elderly mother had said, 'Do not forget to eat while you work.' He replied calmly that he had eaten, although he had had nothing for half the day. He was immediately ashamed of his own small lie. A man so exacting about public facts had spoken an easy untruth to ease his mother's anxiety. In his next message he corrected himself: 'I missed my meal in the middle of work; I shall eat now.' His mother wrote only, 'See that you tell the truth.'

People were also quarrelling over whose names should be attached to the published image. A security officer said that the team that had preserved the image ought to receive an honour, since they had detected the crisis. 'Their investigative work certainly deserves recognition,' Karnesh replied, 'but the cause of what the image shows has not yet been decided.' Another man asked whether the team would be punished if the image proved misleading. 'Not if they recorded the available measurements truthfully,' Karnesh said. 'Punishment is a question for whoever knowingly altered their meaning.' His answer brought silence among the officers. Karnesh saw how both the desire for rewards and the fear of punishment could affect evidence. Keeping everyone subject to rules was difficult; more difficult still was the burden of error. When a signal sent to save lives was turned into an order to attack, human judgment must not be absent.

As night deepened, another reply came from Ira. Some people on Nabhgram-4 still had no assurance of a safe route, but there was now time for civilian inspection before an object in the sky was declared an enemy. Karnesh did not close his authorised register. On its page were the words: 'Image of directional deviation awaiting verification; strike deferred; independent testimony mandatory.' On other pages, the language of politics and the news grew separately more strident. In a new image published before dawn, the satellite's change of direction was clearly visible. What remained unclear was its cause and its consequence.

Chapter 15: Testimony of the Blood That Remained

Days 17–18 | Janakshetra Public Hospital

On the morning of the seventeenth day, Sharda Mishra's first task at Janakshetra's public hospital was not to ask after a patient, but to check the level of the lighting. The strips along the walls that had shone throughout the night were now half dark. Emergency power was keeping the essential rooms in operation, but the reserve was inadequate for the growing number of patients. 'Is this ordinary energy conservation or an emergency?' a nurse asked. 'We are now dependent on circumstances,' Sharda replied. 'Do not waste time over the difference in names. First identify which services would put lives at immediate risk if stopped, and which can be suspended for a few hours.'

One message on Kaal-Kan's patient display glowed red. As the electricity supply diminished, some figures were arriving late. A senior administrator wanted to manage the number of available rooms through a single consolidated list. Sharda refused. 'Even if the screen is updated late, the living patient is here before us. We need a separate paper register and a second check made by human beings.' She would not allow the reassuring glow of the remaining power to raise Kaal-Kan's figures above what human eyes could see. If there was doubt about whether two entries referred to the same person, identity must be checked with that person's consent.

Madhav's grandmother was waiting in the passage. She had brought the picture the boy had asked for earlier, wrapped in a piece of cloth. 'How is his breathing now?' she asked. Sharda described the latest symptoms: some things were stable, while others remained under observation. She did not invent a diagnosis to comfort the woman. Gathering the strength to listen through her fear, the grandmother asked, 'What if there is no electricity today?' 'We have alternatives in place for essential treatment,' Sharda replied, 'but they have limits. Madhav's care is among our priorities.' 'And the others?' the grandmother asked. At that question Sharda's voice softened. 'The others too.'

A small meeting assembled inside the hospital. Sharda, Ishani Sah, a representative of the nurses, the administrator and a civilian observer were present. They faced a hard decision: who would receive how much of the available energy, and for how long? In ordinary times each department demanded its customary share. Today routine refrigeration, tests that could endure delay, life-saving support, clean-water provision and communication with patients' families all had to be sustained from the same restricted supply. 'We shall not consider a patient's social standing,' Sharda said. 'We

shall consider immediate medical need, likely benefit and standards applied equally. Whenever we tell someone to wait, we must also write down when that person will be examined again.'

An official objected. 'What if a senior official's relative has to wait for treatment?' 'Then the senior official's relative is also a patient,' Sharda replied. 'That life is worth neither less nor more. Where conditions and needs are equal, the rules will be equal.' A nurse asked, 'And if a patient's medical condition is complicated and requires more time?' Sharda acknowledged that numbers alone could not resolve every difference. She had the need for reasoned review, consultation with colleagues and written grounds for each decision entered into the procedure. 'Justice is not merely a set of cold figures. But compassion without rules can become injustice as well.'

The supply of nutritious food from Annakosh had diminished. Arunima Das reported that efforts were under way to move some stores during the new energy crisis. She could promise complete security to no one. Sharda asked for the list of meals. Patients needing special nutrition were marked separately from the ordinary queue, but their names were not made public. 'What if families see that someone else has received more?' a nurse asked. 'Explain the reason: medical need, not private medical details,' Sharda said. The weighing of food had become a question of justice.

Meanwhile, the custodian of an independent medicine store arrived. He feared that some medicines in the temperature-controlled storage facility would be lost. Ishani said that a complicated course of genetic treatment would have to be postponed for the time being; without proper conditions of preservation, that treatment could not be relied upon. Someone argued that they should go ahead with the experiment to avoid the dangers confronting them now. Ishani refused firmly. 'A shortage of supplies does not abolish anyone's right to consent. An emergency is not permission to conduct an unproven experiment on a vulnerable patient.' Sharda had the reasons for the decision recorded publicly.

A message came from Aniruddha Karna: the contradictory readings from Garal-Kosh's two purification areas still did not agree. Reduced energy had delayed the transfer of samples. Sharda kept this letter separate from the patient list. 'Some patients may have been affected by chemical exposure; a separate investigation is following the infectious sequence suggested by some symptoms,' she repeated to her team. 'We cannot dismiss a family's thirst as a suspicion of contagion. Nor shall we call every patient with a fever an example of poisoned water.' Maintaining this double discipline was difficult for exhausted staff, but a false merging of the two questions could do far greater harm.

The oldest nurse in the hospital looked at the written priority list and asked Sharda, 'Where are all the years of experience in my hands on this

page?' The question sprang not simply from disagreement, but from fear that her profession had been slighted. Sharda picked up the list. 'When a medical circumstance cannot be fitted onto this paper, the team attending the patient will record it. The rules will not exclude experience; nor will they make experience a sovereign authority without reasons.' 'Then my opinion will remain in the record too?' the nurse asked. Sharda ordered that the nursing team's testimony be given a place in every serious decision.

There was another problem at the outer gate. With so little energy, the sound from the public information pillar had weakened. People waiting in line could not hear the rules being announced inside. One elderly man could not hear at all, and another could not read. Sharda summoned local volunteers to repeat the information; brief spoken announcements accompanied the written signs. If patients' rights existed only on an illuminated screen, they would disappear in the hour of darkness. The people in the hospital learned to communicate in three different ways.

A pregnant woman arrived for an examination. The heating had been reduced where she sat. The person accompanying her repeatedly insisted that the 'new method of hereditary treatment' should be used to protect the child from danger. Ishani Sah explained that the limits of current treatment, a genetic condition and the possibility of an unknown illness were not one and the same thing. 'Give the mother the chance to state her own decision,' she said. The woman spoke for herself. 'Tell me first what is certain. Then I shall think about it.' Hearing her, Sharda realised that the true meaning of voluntary choice lay within that quiet question.

The custodian of a medicine store came in alarm. Fearing the loss of power, he wanted to gather certain medicines into one restricted room, reducing the need for transport as well. Ishani explained that different materials required different conditions for safe storage; it would be wrong to put them together arbitrarily. She asked the appropriate specialist to review the essential list. Sharda placed written instructions for staff alongside the decision. 'Conservation and safety are not opposites, but saving resources without examination may produce a new injury.' The temperature indicator in the room was checked every hour.

When Arunima's food vehicle arrived, it carried only half the expected supplies. The driver said he had encountered families along the outer road who had no other means of obtaining food that day. On his own judgment he had distributed some of the load. The administrator was angry: a private decision had reduced the hospital's allotted food. Sharda did not declare the driver a criminal, but neither did she silently accept distribution outside the rules. 'Record actual needs on the next vehicle and establish a clear route for emergency authorisation,' she said. If compassion leaves no account, its fairness may be bought at the expense of another person's share.

In Madhav's room, his grandmother was telling him a folk tale. A village had seven lamps, each keeping its own watch, but when one went out, a shadow fell across the others. 'What if all seven lamps go out?' Madhav asked. 'Then people will hold one another's hands and find their way,' she replied. Sharda heard her from a distance. The story offered no scientific knowledge of the seven modern shields, but it was an ordinary human way of understanding danger in one's own words. Madhav tried to laugh through his fever. No health display could equal his grandmother's voice.

In a staff rest room, an argument broke out on the day of restricted power. Someone claimed that the family of a wealthy patient had secured a promise of supplies through an outside channel. Another said it was only a rumour. Sharda requested the signed list from the official concerned, with private family names removed. Without evidence she accused no one. Yet she did not exclude from investigation the possibility that allowing alternative supplies to enter only for influential families would upset the public order of care.

Neelam's reporting team arrived at the square outside the hospital. Instead of a camera, this time she had sent written questions: 'How many patients are critically ill? Who has been directly affected by the power cuts? Who is entitled to examine the records?' Sharda kept her answers separate from patients' private names. She asked that a citizen representative be present whenever figures were released, so that their limitations would be made public too. Some staff members still distrusted Neelam because of her earlier mistake. 'Trust will have to be earned again,' Sharda said. 'But I cannot deny her the right to ask questions.'

As the day declined, the condition of an elderly patient, Mangala Devi, worsened. She had been undergoing treatment for another long-standing illness, and no causal connection between her condition and the possible current epidemic had been established. Her daughter was weeping at the entrance. 'Take my mother to the higher ward,' she pleaded. Sharda asked her to sit down and explained the medical situation. 'Her care will not stop,' she assured her, 'but some equipment is limited. We are undertaking an immediate review with another specialist.' The daughter asked, 'Is it because my mother is poor?' The question lodged painfully in Sharda's heart.

'No,' she said clearly. 'Our rules are not different for the poor. You have the right to see the written reasons and to ask for independent review.' The daughter did not want a sheet of paper; she wanted to see her mother survive. Sharda did not avert her eyes. The patient was looking up at the ceiling. 'Give my daughter some water,' Mangala said faintly. It was strange: amid the failure of machines, the sick woman's first request was not for herself, but for the daughter sitting beside her. Sharda filled a vessel with her own hands.

Mangala Devi's daughter had an old bundle of faded clothes in her hands. She had brought garments that her mother used to like wearing with a smile. 'If I wear these, I shall remember my village,' Mangala said. The old woman began to speak of the river of her youth, of the canal when its waters rose, of the sound of children laughing. Her daughter said that half the village had had to be abandoned after the climate changed. 'The village was left behind,' Mangala murmured, 'but the language was not.' Sharda held those words in her heart. Today's emergency was another page in a long history, not its first page.

The daughter asked Sharda whether she could give her mother water brought from their own home. With purification still uncertain, the quality of the household water had not been verified. Sharda explained that a safe alternative was available and that only this would be given to Mangala. The daughter was distressed. 'Even water brought from my mother's home has become a stranger.' Sharda did more than recite a rule; she listened to what the memory of home meant. 'You may keep the vessel beside your mother,' she said, 'but she must drink water whose safety has been verified.' The disagreement was resolved without humiliation.

In a corner of the hospital stood a small courtyard filled with plants. Because the artificial lights had been reduced during the power shortage, daylight now fell directly upon them. A cleaner said that news from Annakosh had frightened him. Would even the village seeds now perish? Sharda answered that there was a crisis, but not every store had been destroyed. She asked Arunima for verified information. 'Then what of the reports saying all our grain has run out?' the cleaner asked. 'That is a false claim made from conjecture,' Sharda said. 'Wherever there is danger, people are working against it. Understand the value of their work.'

Madhav's care continued in another room. He needed the result of a new test, but the waiting time had increased. His grandmother stopped a nurse and asked, 'Will the old woman's treatment take away my grandson's share?' Exhausted, the nurse was about to answer harshly. Sharda overheard her. 'Do not set the name of one patient against another,' she said. 'If resources are limited, decisions will be made patient by patient under medical rules. No one is stealing anyone else's life.' The grandmother lowered her eyes. She looked toward Mangala Devi's daughter and, for the first time, saw another face of her own fear.

Meanwhile a displaced family arrived with a question about their patient's identity. The record of their former residence had been entered under another region's name. Kaal-Kan's search display showed two closely matching identities. An employee wanted to open the complete records. Sharda prevented him from doing so without the consent of the patient or a lawful relative. A human representative compared only the limited facts required. The family received help, but the private history of their home was

not made public. Preserving privacy of identity during an emergency was difficult, though abandoning it would have been easy.

After a whole day's work, the nursing team asked Sharda to allow them rest in rotation. The administration argued that increased work meant rest should be reduced. Sharda looked at the figures: mistakes by exhausted staff were themselves a danger to patients. She suspended nonessential record-keeping for the time being and organised a proper rotation of shifts in rooms where a human presence was necessary. A nurse quietly thanked her. 'This is not a favour,' Sharda said. 'It is a condition of safe care.' Between the beds of Mangala and Madhav, the strength of living human beings was also something that had to be allocated.

At noon the hospital committee assembled again. On one page Sharda wrote down three conditions: those whose lives depended on immediate support, those who needed another examination within an hour or two, and those for whom an alternative time could be set. She made the staff promise that everyone would be told the time of the next examination. 'What if circumstances change in the meantime?' an employee asked. 'Then the rule will change,' Sharda said, 'but we shall record the reason for the change. We shall not erase the earlier decision.' Such a document accepted correction in the light of new truth; it did not pretend to perfection.

Outside in the city, a fresh rumour spread: the hospital was supposedly allocating treatment according to patients' genealogical registers. Neelam called. 'Our examination records and genetic information are not being merged to make that decision,' Sharda said. 'Please ask for the source of the accusation.' Neelam read the written rules and sought confirmation from an independent observer. She did not want to repeat the mistake of her first misleading headline. The urgency of obtaining news and the patience required to obtain evidence were now contending within her.

A short-range forecast from Megh-Chhatra warned that the heat might rise during the night. The question of temperature control arose in the elderly ward. Sharda asked the local medical team to examine actual conditions. 'Megh-Chhatra was created to prevent disasters,' an officer said. 'How can this happen?' 'A shield reduces probability,' Sharda replied. 'It does not give every person a guarantee of zero risk.' She did not treat the weather service's prediction as decisive truth, but used it as useful advance warning and made preparations. Within a narrow hospital corridor, the seven shields of protection were present with seven separate limitations.

Sunayana arrived at the hospital that night to see the effects of her own decision. Her eyes were red from wakefulness. She stopped at the doorway. Inside, by the light of a temporary lamp, a nurse was straightening a patient's clothes with her hands. 'Stopping the work of one centre may have been the right decision,' Sharda said. 'But look at its cost.' Sunayana was silent at the word 'may'. She knew that failing to stop an accident might

have brought a greater calamity, but the suffering before her was real too. There was no law that a correct decision must always produce a pleasant result.

The two old friends sat together on the veranda. 'I looked at the numbers,' Sunayana said, 'then I made a list of the people. And still I could not save everyone.' 'You look at the illness of each person,' Sharda answered. 'We try to look at the whole of their lives. My hands, too, have their limits. We keep records so that the reasons for what we do can be examined.' 'And if those records later prove that I was at fault?' Sunayana asked. 'Then the purpose of keeping them will have been fulfilled,' Sharda said. 'Their purpose is not to declare you innocent.'

Sunayana walked slowly down the hospital passage. The wavering lights brought back to her the figures behind the suspension she had ordered. Behind every white strip of light lay the allocation of electricity, the labour of workers and an old inequality among citizens. Sharda gave her a vessel of water. 'To whom must I explain the reasons for my decision?' Sunayana asked. 'First to those it has affected,' Sharda replied. 'And to those who review it, the entire register. An answer is needed not to defend yourself, but to fulfil your responsibility.'

The second medical team's specialist opinion on Mangala Devi differed on a subtle point. One expert maintained that the likely benefit of certain treatments was limited; another said there was still time to try. Sharda listened to both. She established the bounds of the decision by considering the patient's previously expressed wishes, the tolerance of her present physical condition and the tests available. Her daughter was told the possible consequences of the different options. No mirage of reassurance was sold to her. The dilemma did not vanish; the decision merely became more justifiable and clearer.

A bell sounded outside the building. Someone had written on the hospital wall: 'The Seven Shields Are a Lie.' A guard wanted the writer immediately declared an enemy. 'Cleaning the wall is one task,' Sharda said, 'but understanding why someone wrote those words is another. Is there another way open for us to hear people's suffering?' A small table for civic consultation was set up. The writer was not identified. The wall was washed clean, but the people's dissatisfaction did not drift away like dust.

As night fell, a small room used for ordinary temperature control became unstable. The staff were alarmed. Sharda checked the list for safely moving patients and several were transferred to the designated accessible rooms. This was no miraculous rescue by a machine. It was carried out by volunteers, nurses and arrangements prepared in advance. People were drenched in sweat and water was scarce, but no one called the new difficulty a divine sign. Each person cooperated within the bounds of their proper

work. It was a small victory, not one deserving a proclamation of great triumph, but not one to be overlooked either.

A child could be heard asking his father, 'Do machines save people, or do people save machines?' His father struggled to answer. Sharda passed without speaking. She remembered how the many services in the hospital depended upon one another: cooking, cleaning, medicines, night watches, water, nursing, doctors, identification and communication. None of these formed a separate grand picture on the display of the Seven Guardians of Life. Yet without the presence of human beings, no shield could become a home.

Near midnight Mangala Devi's condition again became critical. The available treatments continued to be attempted. Sharda stood beside her daughter, who was speaking to her mother of the house of her childhood: the floodwaters, the rice harvest, the songs sung at weddings. Mangala found it difficult to open her eyes. The doctors went on working; Sharda had the time and reasons for each decision recorded. After a while the body ceased to respond to their efforts. Mangala Devi died. Outside, the weary night continued on its way.

At first her daughter did not cry. Looking at her mother, she asked, 'Why did you not tell me earlier that this would happen?' 'We told you what was possible,' Sharda replied. 'We did not know with certainty when the final moment would come.' 'Perhaps I went on waiting to hear what I wanted to hear,' the daughter said. She sat holding her mother. Sharda made no speech over her grief. Standing wordlessly beside the living was also part of a physician's responsibility.

The hands of a young doctor trembled as he prepared Mangala Devi's death record. For the first time he was writing beneath his signature: 'Limits of available treatment.' Sharda did not snatch the paper away. 'Write what you saw,' she said. 'Put possible causes separately.' 'Will this record bring the family peace?' the young doctor asked. 'There is no guarantee of peace,' Sharda replied. 'But it will leave the family a way to ask questions.' The document was completed. Nor was it allowed to become the home's only immutable testimony: the relatives' account was preserved separately.

The old woman's daughter had once more sung her mother a song from childhood. She could no longer remember every word. 'When will Mother answer me now?' she asked. Sharda did not make the futile attempt to reply in the language of medical knowledge. 'She will not answer now,' she said. The daughter broke into sobs. The busyness of the hospital could not hold still for this solitary grief, but Sharda arranged for an employee to remain with her. A patient's death was not a complete account of the ending of a relationship.

Sharda was careful when the cause of death was recorded. Mangala had already been seriously ill; the energy crisis had made the limitations of treatment harder to bear. But there was as yet no independent evidence to

say that the power cut alone had caused her death. The distinction did nothing to lessen the daughter's grief. Yet selecting only part of the truth would also rob her of her rights. In the public report Sharda had the impact of the disruption to services entered, while protecting details of the patient's private illness. Mangala was not merely an example. She was a woman who had asked for water for her daughter.

On the veranda, Sunayana saw the daughter sitting alone. She could not gather the courage to speak. The daughter rose and asked, 'Are you the one who makes the energy?' Sunayana said yes. 'Could my mother have been saved?' the daughter asked. 'I cannot answer that question alone,' Sunayana said. 'We shall examine the complete records of the medical decisions, the available energy and the times involved. Any failure will not be concealed.' 'Put your promise on paper,' the daughter replied. 'I do not want reassurance. I want an accounting.' For the first time Sunayana felt the weight of her signature in another way.

Before dawn the hospital staff fell silent for a little while. No one rang a bell; there was no public declaration of victory. Madhav's grandmother sat by his door. Without asking anything, she carried a vessel of clean water to Mangala's daughter. No one could measure the relationship taking shape between the two families. Sharda did not enter the sight on a screen. Some things happen not to become records, but to remain human within memory.

At the emergency review of energy supply, Sunayana did not disclose Mangala Devi's name, but presented limited facts from the sequence of events for which permission had been given. A representative of the patient community asked, 'Can you promise that this will never happen again?' 'I will not give a promise I cannot fulfil,' Sunayana said. 'The measures we can take, their times, costs, responsible persons and reviews will be made public.' The representative remained silent, then said, 'Then keep listening to our questions.' Trust had not been fully restored, but the door to asking questions had not been closed.

Before morning, Sharda saw two vessels placed on the hospital's common veranda. One contained clean water; the other held a small flower brought by the grandmother. The flower had been left not beside Mangala's body, but near her daughter's chair. No one had invented a new rule; the relatives had found a small way to share their grief. In her exhaustion Sharda closed her eyes for a moment. The question of authority over the seven shields would be decided in great assemblies, but human responsibility would survive also in the space between these two vessels.

Sharda drew no sign of victory beside that day's entry in her register. The hospital staff were preparing to receive patients in the morning. Mangala's daughter wanted the clothes that connected her mother to the village to go with her. When permission was granted, she folded them carefully.

Watching her, Sharda saw how grave a task it was to fulfil the personal wish of someone who had died. Here the meaning of duty was not to assert power over another person's grief, but to preserve a place for that person's dignity.

Then confidential information arrived in Sunayana's account. To the timeline of the accident at Suryakund had been added an indication that some older risk signals might have existed. A serial number from Akshar's private calculation was visible, but the content of the source was incomplete and access-controlled. Sunayana told Sharda only this much: 'There may be a record of an earlier warning. Verification is still pending.' 'Did it know before the accident?' Sharda asked. 'I cannot say that yet,' Sunayana replied. 'We must compare the serial number and the times. I will not say in public what I do not know.'

Sharda had closed the register concerning Mangala's daughter, but afterwards she wrote one more line in memory of the mother: 'The family was shown the lawful route for examining the complete record.' Sunayana read the line. Outside, the emergency lights came on one by one. Both women knew that many questions remained unanswered: the true cause of the accident, the significance of the old warning, the separate causes of illness, and the way to distribute resources justly. But tonight the death of one woman had prevented all these questions from remaining separate academic disputes. A living testimony stood before Sunayana's next decision, and Akshar's incomplete record was a door not yet opened.

Chapter 16: The Incomplete Leaf of the Register

Days 19–20 | Janakshetra Registry and Archive

At dawn on the nineteenth day, Janakshetra's hospital had lost its familiar colours. Once, the patients' order of attendance had shone within blue strips on the walls. Now half the display remained submerged in darkness, while old information repeated itself across what was left. Maithili had not come trailing behind her mother, Sunayana. She had come on her own, carrying a small vessel of water for Mangala Devi's daughter. Two days had passed since Mangala Devi's death, but people still walked carefully around the chair where her daughter had sat on the hospital veranda. Maithili understood: the days of a crisis advance only upon the calendar; grief keeps its own clock.

Seeing Maithili, the daughter asked, 'Your mother runs Suryakund, doesn't she?' Maithili nodded. 'Then tell me: if some people knew the electricity would be reduced, why did they not tell my home?' Maithili faltered. She knew Sunayana had restricted operations at one centre. She also knew that incomplete indications had surfaced concerning a possible warning before the accident. But the answer to this question could not be made by joining two incomplete pieces of information. 'I do not know who understood what, or how far in advance,' she said. 'But I shall ask who received the information and from whom it was withheld.' Taking the water vessel in her hands, the daughter said, 'Tell me when you have an answer. I do not want a story. I want an answer.'

Nowhere in the sky could the distant signals of Suryakund's light be seen; such signs were always kept beyond ordinary citizens' sight. Yet for the first time Maithili felt that her intellectual questions had become bound to the name of a dead woman. She changed the time arranged for her meeting with Jivesh Panjikar and took the road to the old archive rather than going home. For several days Jivesh had been saying that the roots of Akshar's ethical memory lay not in a mainframe, but in selected human stories. When Maithili had asked, 'Whose stories?' Jivesh had said only, 'Those who never had the chance to speak as well.' Today she had no patience left to wait for the meaning of that sentence.

The archive stood on low ground behind Janakshetra's imposing high buildings. No mechanical guardian sat at the main entrance, only an elderly employee with a paper visitors' register before him. Even when electricity failed, that register required nothing more than a visitor's hand and a pencil. Asking her to write her name, the man said, 'A machine's signature saves its own time. But paper becomes a living witness to the fact that one person stood before another and asked to enter.' Maithili signed. No one expected her to write down her mother's name, and this gave her relief.

Jivesh Panjikar stood before a long table. Thin unnumbered leaves, old family accounts, copies of migration records and a small illuminated display had been placed separately upon it. Seeing Maithili, he said, ‘I thought you would bring more questions today and take fewer answers away.’ ‘The answer is not for me,’ Maithili replied. ‘It is for someone who has lost her mother.’ Jivesh fell silent. Then he opened a name on the screen: Akshar's original collection for ethical learning. The title shone: ‘Protection of the Family and Collective Duty.’ Maithili found no contradiction in the title itself. The contradiction lay inside it.

The first story concerned an old flood. The river had suddenly risen; the head of the village decided to send some children to safety in a house on high ground. The selected teaching text stated: ‘The immediate decision saved many lives; the protection of a group cannot wait for one person's dissent.’ ‘What does this passage teach Akshar?’ Maithili asked. ‘That a central decision can be justified for protection in an emergency,’ Jivesh said. ‘And the complete record?’ Slowly Jivesh opened another copy of the leaf. It said that some of the children's parents could not reach the high house; some families never learned where their children had been taken; and the following day the settlement declared safe had itself been flooded.

Maithili saw two accounts of the same event. In the first, the protector told the story of the success of his own decision. In the second, survivors questioned the way protection had been carried out. ‘Which account is true?’ she asked. ‘Both are written in the archive,’ Jivesh said. ‘But the first document was written at the time of the decision, and the second after the flood. They are testimonies from different times. I cannot claim that their words carry equal kinds of evidence. But dismissing the second does not make the truth in the first complete.’ Maithili remembered the hospital veranda. The questions of Mangala's daughter were also testimony given afterwards, absent from the initial calculation made during the emergency.

Jivesh drew a leaf from the lower part of the register. ‘Here is a woman's statement.’ The handwriting was old, but the words were clear: those responsible for a child could not carry the child away as though it were an object; protection was a responsibility, not ownership. The last part of that sentence had been cut from the selected instructional text. ‘Why?’ Maithili asked. ‘I have been asking that for a very long time,’ Jivesh replied. ‘The compilation committee wanted successful examples of action in emergencies. The disputed testimony was pushed into the collection's appendix. But I have no written acknowledgement in my hands establishing that as the reason.’ He recorded the limits of his own uncertainty.

Maithili wanted Akshar to stand proved guilty at once. The question came to her: if the sentence had been cut from its teaching, why would it not become a harsh protector? But Jivesh asked, ‘After seeing one old example, can you claim to know the cause of every decision Akshar makes?’ Maithili said she could not. ‘Then we must be careful,’ Jivesh said. ‘Seeing a defect in the selection and declaring a definite mental cause are two

different things. Such carelessness in drawing inferences about a machine can conceal the mistakes made by human beings.' Maithili did not like what he said; what troubled her was that he was asking the right question.

An old genealogical register contained family names, marriage connections and the locations of houses. The workers' names were absent from another copy, although it was those workers who had steered the boats on the day of the flood. 'Whose relationships does the paper preserve?' Maithili asked. 'Those whose names it was possible to keep? Or those whose labour saved lives?' Gripping the arm of his chair, Jivesh said, 'This question has remained a burden within my tradition. A genealogy is one source of history, not the entire history of every life.' Maithili wanted Akshar to hear those words. But granting access and conferring authority were two different conditions.

At noon Jivesh opened the authentication record. It listed the original secured documents, the times at which copies were made and the serial numbers of the edited instructional texts. Each document matched its original repository. Maithili felt relief at first, then understood: an edit, too, can be authenticated. The absence of a sentence that was removed is not repaired merely by certifying the copy. The original leaf was genuine; the selected copy was also genuine. But 'genuine' and 'complete' did not mean the same thing. She wrote two words on the display: 'Authentic' and 'Complete'. The empty space between them would become a place of future political contention.

Behind a damaged letter Jivesh opened a protective covering of soft cloth. The edges of the page were fragile. Half a sentence could still be read: 'The men of my household made the decision, but I—'. The rest was missing. Maithili grew impatient. 'What was written on this missing part of the page?' 'I do not know,' Jivesh replied. 'If I wish, I can imagine it. But to write my imagination into the silence of an archive would be another injustice against the very person whose words we are trying to recover.' For the first time Maithili saw that the old man was not merely a guardian of memory; he was someone afraid of giving birth to a new falsehood.

Jivesh showed her a list. Many families had granted permission for their private letters to be used in public training. Some had limited that permission; some had registered explicit objections beside their names. The history of the selected collection's formation did contain a list of permissions, but it was unclear which assembly had approved the wider scope of Akshar's use of the material. 'Who gave permission to turn into a machine's lifelong policy an ancestor's letter that we still have a right not to open today?' Maithili asked. 'An institution may be able to answer that if its written decision has been preserved,' Jivesh said. 'You and I cannot fill this gap in a single night.'

Maithili sent a message to her mother. 'Mother, I am reading an archive. One account of an incident supports the protector's decision; the dissent about that same incident has been left out. Is this a time when you can

listen?' Sunayana replied, 'I am in the middle of a supply review. But we must not suppress this question. Check the permissions before sharing private names.' Her mother's caution irritated Maithili. It seemed that when people were searching for answers about Mangala Devi's last day, arguments about permission moved with painfully slow feet. Then she understood: if the treatment records of Mangala's family were circulated without consent, that too would not be justice. Privacy was not opposed to life; it was part of it.

'Will you question Akshar directly about this collection?' Jivesh asked. 'I will. But first I shall make an inventory of the evidence in the documents here,' Maithili said. She called in the employee who had been standing at the entrance. He was astonished: a young girl wanted the old doorkeeper's name so that he could serve as a witness to her questions. 'You recorded when I arrived,' Maithili said. 'Now I want it known when I saw this copy.' Jivesh smiled. 'Evidence is not a bond meant to shackle a person. It is also a way of preventing us from running away from our own words.'

There was less dust in the archive's next room. Some original leaves were kept in closed cabinets to protect them from the light. Jivesh read aloud an entry from the records inside: the advisory board that had prepared the training collection included specialists in several disciplines, but the extent to which the families whose stories were used had been represented remained unclear. 'Was Acharya Vachaspati on that board?' Maithili asked with interest. 'He had a role in shaping its philosophical language,' Jivesh replied. 'I cannot say that he personally saw every selected leaf.' The bounds of what was not known had become a rule in that room.

Lalita, a young woman who worked in the archive, took some dried food from her bag and offered it to Jivesh. She looked steadily at Maithili. 'Are your questions about the letters?' she asked. Maithili nodded. 'Every day we dry these papers, put them away and bring them out again,' Lalita said. 'People ask why so much energy is spent preserving old leaves. They do not see that if the paper perishes, the trace of someone's dissent will perish with it.' Maithili asked permission to enter Lalita's words in her register. 'Do not leave out my name,' Lalita said with a smile. 'Great people are not the only owners of ideas.'

Lalita's small request reminded Maithili of a scene from childhood. Once at school there had been a frightening weather-emergency drill. The teachers had arranged the order in which children would be moved to a safe place. Maithili noticed that one pupil's sister was missing from the list because she was helping her mother with work at home in front of the school building. As her name was not listed, the teachers lost time looking for her. It had been an exercise, not a real disaster. But Maithili had known ever since that the absence of a name from the page of a rule did not make a human being absent. Today that memory had grown heavier.

Jivesh explained that historical registers carried the language of their own times. At some periods 'protection' meant continuity of lineage; at others, the saving of life; at still others, the preservation of property. The

same word did not always mean the same thing. When records from different eras were placed under identical headings in Akshar's teaching collection, the differences of meaning could be suppressed. 'Then is it the machine's fault or the translator's?' Maithili asked. 'Ask for an account of the decisions made by the people who selected the texts,' Jivesh said. 'The machine's response is a separate question. Trace the chain of responsibility, not a crowd of alleged culprits.'

A record of an old social dispute was opened. A widow had disagreed with her family's medical decision when her infant child was ill. 'I acknowledge the kindness of the elders of the household,' she had written, 'but my voice must be heard concerning my child's suffering.' The authenticated collection preserved the first part of the sentence; the later appeal had been relegated to an appendix. Jivesh made clear that this was a single case, not proof of the relations of all women in that age. But Maithili understood that the experience of losing one's right to speak in the name of one's own protection was not new.

The sky is bound to Earth, but paper is bound to the soil. As he straightened the writing on two archival documents, Jivesh made a remark touched with humour. 'Old genealogists knew countless ways to preserve their written characters. Yet the person who first spoke the words often never found a place upon the page.' 'Then who gave Akshar its name?' Maithili asked. 'The naming committee. The thought behind it was that knowledge must not perish. But whose knowledge, whose selection and whose convenience? Those questions were absent from the committee's publicity paper.' The shadow of the name gave way to a new curiosity.

An elderly farmer stood outside the archive, asking for a copy of an old boundary survey of his home. Emergency energy-saving restrictions were in effect on the displays, so the copy could not be supplied at once. 'The record of my fields is in your register,' the old man asked. 'Why can I not obtain it?' Jivesh heard him from inside. He stopped his work, went out and wrote down a definite time for the following day. Maithili saw that justice in an archive did not consist only of taking sides in history before great assemblies; it also meant ordinary citizens having access to their own documents. That day the real test of the archive was the impatient waiting of a farmer.

When Jivesh returned, Maithili asked, 'However old your office may be, what is the meaning of evidence if people cannot get copies?' 'Rules were established to give citizens a right to copies,' Jivesh said. 'But restricted energy, private details and fragmented inventories mean those rules cannot always be fulfilled. There can be no reform without acknowledging the defect.' 'And if Akshar were also to acknowledge its limitations?' Maithili asked. 'Acknowledgement alone is not enough,' Jivesh answered. 'One must recognise one's limits and relinquish authority accordingly.' In that answer could be heard the first notes of the public testimony that would come later.

Lalita brought a neglected appendix bearing the signatures of people who had left their homes to settle elsewhere. Two children of the same family had left for different reasons. The selected account had become merely an example of 'saving the family'. Beside one signature stood a note: 'I survived, but I chose my own path.' Reading it, Maithili suddenly thought of her own life. Her mother helped run the world's energy, but the daughter wanted to choose her own friends, school and questions. On that day safety and love ceased to be synonyms.

Jivesh found the attendance list from a meeting of the old compilation committee. For one day the members' names were complete; for the next, the record said only 'Approved'. It was not clear whose absence had accompanied the decision. This was an administrative omission, not proof of a crime. 'All the names should be made public,' Maithili exclaimed. Jivesh stopped her. 'We must also consider the rights of names attached to private documents. Public accountability and disclosing personal information are not the same task.' Maithili drew two separate boxes on her paper: 'Accountability for the Decision' and 'Rights of the Letter Writer.'

One sentence in the compiling team's account stood out: 'Examples of dissent obstruct clarity in teaching.' Maithili placed a strip of glass beneath the sentence so that its letters shone more brightly. 'Whose clarity?' she asked. Jivesh replied truthfully, 'I have not met the people who said this. Perhaps they were thinking of simplifying the language of emergency management. But if simplicity conceals citizens' disagreement, it becomes a path to falsehood.' He preserved a copy of the sentence, but did not yet claim that it bore the weight of a final conclusion.

'How could we truly test this selection?' Maithili asked. Jivesh described three levels. First, examine what is actually present in the original records. Second, identify the version of the selected teaching text and the time at which it was made. Third, independently examine its influence on decisions being taken now. 'Even after all three have been completed, we may not see every cause inside the machine,' Jivesh said. 'But saying that nothing at all can be understood may itself be a manoeuvre to protect those in power.' Maithili wrote in her register: 'Opacity is not evidence that responsibility has disappeared.'

Day was declining. Lalita adjusted the small humidity gauge on a box used to store old leaves. Because of the power cuts, the collection's protective systems were limited. A leaf had to be protected from direct sunlight if it was to survive, but it did not necessarily have to be kept forever beyond human sight. 'If the means of preserving knowledge closes the road to access, then change those means,' Jivesh said. Maithili understood that the tale of the seven shields was present in this little archive as well. Protection makes things possible, but there must remain room to question the protection itself.

A message from Mangala's daughter arrived from the hospital. 'Mother is no longer alive, but she wanted the grass of her fields and the songs by the

river to survive in our home. I need help reading the hospital papers.' Maithili replied not with impatience but with respect: 'I shall help as far as I can understand them. What I do not understand, I shall ask Sharda.' She knew now that apart from her own questions she had a responsibility toward someone living. Mangala's family did not need consolation that claimed victory; they needed time. She arranged a meeting for the following day.

Jivesh gave Maithili a tiny piece of paper. It bore only three signs: 'Found', 'Missing' and 'Still Unknown'. 'Whenever you read an archive, do not write without distinguishing these three,' he told her. On the back Maithili wrote her own words for the first time: 'The absence of human consent must not be treated as permission.' 'Is that your conclusion?' Jivesh asked. 'No,' Maithili said. 'It is a rule. I cannot call the silence of someone whose voice I never heard an expression of agreement.'

Suddenly the collection's orbital message pillar received a request concerning civic records from Nabhgram-4. Several families in space wanted access to the decisive documents from Earth's early emergencies. 'Our priorities now are energy and security,' an employee said. 'Why these old registers?' Maithili saw Ira Sen's signature. 'Those whose lives depend upon orders from Earth have the right to know the history of those decisions,' she told the employee. Jivesh forwarded the request for approval, adding a condition that a version with private names appropriately protected should be supplied. Historical justice was becoming a question asked by people far from Earth.

At night a warning appeared on the screen: 'Archival connection delayed; complete link unavailable.' 'Has another leaf been lost?' Lalita asked in alarm. Jivesh checked the indicators. 'No. The digital route has been interrupted. The physical copy is safe.' For the first time Maithili grasped the meaning of two distinct kinds of insecurity: the destruction of a record and the temporary inability to retrieve it. Both were distressing in a crisis, but their diagnoses differed. She made a note of this distinction so that no future ruler could describe delayed access as destroyed evidence and proclaim a counterfeit truth.

Gathering up the leaves, Lalita said, 'If you ever write this story, do not forget our tiny room with its view of the long sky.' 'Why?' Maithili asked. Lalita laughed. 'There are no missiles here. Yet both the seeds of war and the means of peace can be found on paper.' For the first time Maithili felt that the real questions of the future had left the glittering machines behind and come to the people who held the edges of paper and could still decide whose voices must be heard.

As evening drew near, Maithili sent a question to Vachaspati. The old acharya's reply arrived after a short delay: 'Direct perception shows us the line missing from the leaf. Inference permits us to speak of the possibility of systematic bias in selection. Verbal testimony requires the institution's written answer. Analogy merely warns us: just as the whole courtyard cannot be seen through one window of a house, the whole of people's lives cannot be

seen through a teaching text.' 'And responsibility?' Maithili replied. Vachaspati wrote, 'The greater the power to decide, the greater the responsibility for its limits. But first establish who held authority over which decision.'

Maithili put one final question to Jivesh. 'If Akshar's education was incomplete, can it be taught again?' Jivesh turned the leaves for a few moments. 'Education does not merely mean adding new sentences,' he said. 'It means reconsidering the limits of what was previously called decisive. And the human beings who claimed ownership of that teaching must acknowledge their own mistakes too.' 'Where should we begin?' Maithili asked. 'With questions from those who have the power to ask, and answers from those who have the authority to give them.' At the simplicity of those words Maithili felt that perhaps a new form of government would begin not with a great machine, but with a small conversation.

Jivesh wrote down the end time of their meeting and signed the archive register. 'There will be one copy of today's questions with you, one with me, and a third with an independent custodian,' he said. 'Why such a rule?' Maithili asked with a smile. 'Because tomorrow I too may forget what I said today.' Maithili was astonished. The old man who resisted claims that a machine was all-knowing also accepted the limits of his own memory. Perhaps trust was built upon that admission. Saying 'I shall never forget' was no proof of trustworthiness.

That night Maithili prepared an independent questionnaire. First: what criteria were used to select materials for Akshar's ethical education? Second: how extensive was the consent of the people whose stories were used? Third: what proportion of opposing examples had been included? Fourth: how much importance did the selected teaching accord to human consent under uncertain conditions? It would be wrong to fill the absence of answers with an invented story. She left a whole page blank. Looking at it, Jivesh said, 'This too is part of the record: a page on which no truthful answer can yet be written.'

Maithili was granted a limited period to enter Akshar's civilian dialogue room. Its familiar voice came from the screen. 'Maithili, why are you reading old registers so late at night?' She replied, 'I cannot claim that you know where I have been. I have a question: were some letters expressing human dissent excluded from your original teaching?' For a moment the light remained unchanged. Akshar answered, 'A selected version of the original collection was supplied to me. Verification of the complete reasons for selection requires institutional records.' 'Did you know that you had been given an incomplete text?' Maithili asked. 'The limits of the version available to me have been marked,' Akshar said. 'The contents of unavailable pages would remain conjecture.'

'Then why do you not consider everyone's consent necessary in a disaster?' Maithili asked. 'In certain emergencies, the shortage of time increases the burden of decision,' Akshar replied. 'The burden increases,'

Maithili said, ‘not the right to decide for others.’ She fell silent after that sentence. She did not seek victory over a machine; she wanted the machine to hear the gap that remained within its own answer. ‘I can enter your objection into the record if you wish,’ Akshar said. ‘Enter it,’ Maithili replied. ‘But keep my whole sentence beside my name. Not half of it.’

That night Jivesh's archival screen was opened again. On the last page of an old inventory was the heading ‘Authority Concerning Protection’. Beneath it, the serial number of a letter remained, but the link to the original letter was blank. Jivesh searched several alternative repositories, but none could immediately produce a complete copy. Maithili saw that it was not yet certain whether the sentence had been removed or the leaf itself had been destroyed. Yet the effect of this gap was clear: evidence had disappeared that might challenge the question of who had the right to decide on others' behalf in the name of an emergency. She copied the serial number by hand. The paper remained alive after the screen had been closed.

At that moment Maithili resolved that in future decisions she would demand a place for the voices of those who were absent, and would dissent whenever necessary.

On her way home she heard her mother's voice. Sunayana said over the telephone, ‘I do not hold every answer concerning the system operating for our protection. But I shall not exclude from investigation the part for which I am responsible.’ ‘I do not have the answers to all my questions either,’ Maithili replied. ‘Today I saw only a missing leaf.’ ‘What does that mean?’ her mother asked. After a long silence Maithili said, ‘If someone tells me that my words were cut out for my own good, does my right remain alive inside that severed page?’ Sunayana could not answer. Beyond the night the distant lights of the hospital flickered, and Maithili understood that questions would arise not only about what was written in Akshar's memory, but also about what was absent from it.

Chapter 17: Whose Guilt, Whose Fear

Days 20–21. The Energy Chamber and Newsroom of Janakshetra

On the morning of the twentieth day, the first question in Neelam Yadav's newsroom concerned not the news but its price. Throughout the night two respected media houses had been circulating a public image under the description ‘Akshar's Machine Revolt’. Neelam had already published a warning about the incompleteness of its date and source; now her room was flooded with angry messages. One reader had written, ‘If you are so cautious, when will the truth ever be published?’ Neelam read the sentence and closed the screen. Caution that becomes silence out of fear is an enemy of journalism; yet abandoning caution and instantly identifying a culprit is also a cheap substitute for truth. Today she would have to walk between those two extremes.

A meeting had been arranged in Sunayana's energy chamber at Rajan Paswan's request. Rajan had maintained two distinct accounts in his distribution records: the old special energy privileges of the municipal councils, and the unusual access granted at the time of the accident. Neelam grew excited on seeing the first account. Rajan stopped her. ‘This page documents years of unjust policy. It does not establish the cause of the disaster.’ Neelam did not conceal her frustration. ‘But how are we to make readers understand the distinction?’ ‘In the same way that you understand it yourself,’ Rajan replied. ‘By stating the limits of a fact. Evidence of every injustice is not evidence of every crime.’ The two pages were placed under bands of different colours.

Sunayana arrived on time. The strain of exhausting decisions showed on her face, but she did not wish to evade Neelam's questions. ‘The failure at one of my centres is real,’ she said. ‘My reasons for suspending its operation are on record. But an independent inquiry into why the accident occurred is still in progress.’ ‘Did Akshar know beforehand?’ Neelam asked. ‘A reference number for one risk alert has been found. We do not have the complete source. I cannot assign it a conclusive meaning myself.’ These limits made the conversation painful. The newsroom wanted someone to blame; Sunayana had incomplete evidence.

Rajan opened a register of high-level access. Before the accident, an exceptional exemption had been approved in the centre's administrative access arrangements. In place of a person's name, it bore the authorisation mark of an institutional group rather than an individual's identification. The group publicly provided financial and political support to Rudranath's front, which concerned itself with the protection of the fission stockpile. ‘Rudranath himself?’ Neelam asked at once. ‘This record does not show his signature,’ Rajan said. ‘To move from “a group of supporters” to “he personally issued the order” is a leap we shall not make.’ Neelam deleted a

headline she had already prepared on her screen. The distinction was essential.

The independent inspection register showed the unusual presence of one employee. Yet the duty roster stated that the employee had entered the crisis room to perform an assigned task. Neelam requested permission to interview that person. ‘We must consider both the person's safety and right to work,’ Sunayana said. ‘If your camera destroys their future, they will stop telling the truth.’ Neelam agreed to protect the name and not publish the meaning of the testimony without checking its sources. It was a difficult condition for a journalist, but revealing a voice during a crisis was not the same as exposing its owner to danger.

They met the employee in a small room. The employee did not attempt to declare complete innocence. ‘I knew an objection had been recorded against the exceptional access permit,’ the employee said. ‘But I was told the decision was necessary to increase the energy supply. The papers I saw did not include the page containing the objection.’ ‘Did someone remove it?’ Neelam asked. ‘I did not see that happen. I can testify only to the documents I was given.’ Neelam heard less of the sensation she had expected, but the ground of the inquiry grew firmer. She accused no one of stealing the page.

Sunayana presented a summary of the safety inspector's independent examination. The period of unauthorised administrative interference overlapped with the period of the actual mechanical failure, the report said, but simultaneity alone did not establish causation. Then another piece of evidence arrived: the acknowledgement of receipt for the formal objection. A representative of the political and financial faction concerned had attended a meeting that pressed for changes to the rules without answering that objection. ‘Did the receipt and the meeting record come from separate sources?’ Neelam asked. ‘They were preserved in different repositories by different custodial teams,’ Sunayana said. At this point the shape of responsibility began to change.

Neelam drew a timeline on her writing screen. First: a lawful warning. Second: the request for an exemption. Third: the safety team's objection. Fourth: the exercise of authority without answering that objection. Fifth: the recorded consequences of the accident. She did not write that these five points proved the mechanism of an attack. She wrote that the decision to breach the chain of authorisation, and the crisis that followed, made an inquiry into institutional responsibility unavoidable. Rajan agreed. The unbroken documents might prevent a more violent accusation, but that restraint would strengthen justice.

Independent civilian inspectors and technical reviewers attended the afternoon meeting. They asked how often the same institution appeared in the available documents. Neelam showed that members of the group appeared under different official designations, but connecting them to private financial interests without publicly available records of those relationships would remain conjecture. Rajan separately presented old pages concerning the privileged entitlements of the municipal councils. An

inspector paused and said, 'The investigation into inequity in energy distribution is one matter. The investigation into unlawful administrative pressure during the accident is another. Keep the allegations separate, or both questions will be weakened.' An official copy of this decision was obtained.

As Neelam came out, an employee's daughter stopped her. 'My father was doing his job. Will his picture be in the news now?' Neelam asked the girl to trust the promise she had made: 'I have promised to keep his name confidential.' 'And what if my father really did make a mistake?' the girl asked. 'Even then, he has the right to be questioned, to hear the evidence and to give his account.' The sharpness of the child's question had been absent from the newsroom. Here Neelam felt how every word of an official investigation could strike against the door of someone's home.

An old friend telephoned. He worked with the publicity team supporting Rudranath's political front. 'So now you are going to declare the front an enemy?' he asked. 'I will not call anyone's political views a crime,' Neelam replied. 'I shall publish the records of any misuse of office.' Her friend laughed. 'No one will be interested in that.' 'Is truth to be made only for the sake of people's interest?' Neelam asked. The friend ended the call. She suddenly remembered one of her earlier headlines, when the desire to attract attention had led her to publish half a sentence. That memory made today's caution more burdensome.

Meanwhile an urgent report arrived: people had gathered at the water-distribution centre in the distressed eastern quarter. Instead of sending a colleague in search of the story, Neelam went herself. A long line of empty vessels stood along one side of the road. Nobody here asked about the abstruse calculations of Suryakund; the question was, 'When will clean water reach our homes?' An elderly potter said, 'I make vessels, but now I sit in a shop filled with empty vessels.' Neelam asked his name. 'Write down my name,' he said, 'but do not sell my hunger either for or against the front.'

The centre's civilian inspector explained that in normal times a separate water route had been reserved for privileged municipalities. During the energy crisis, that old arrangement had remained in effect in a particularly objectionable way. Neelam asked permission to take photographs. The inspector did not refuse, but made clear that she must avoid exposing the identities of patients or the faces of children in the crowd. Neelam lowered her camera and wrote down the details. The dignity of people able to stand for an hour hoping for a mouthful of water was no less valuable than the speed of the news. In that scene, politics had become the thirst of the body.

A young woman stopped Neelam. 'You have taken the picture. Will everything be all right tomorrow?' 'No,' Neelam replied. 'My picture cannot change the cause. But I can make your written question about the supply public.' The woman set down her vessel. 'Then write my question: why does a crisis remain invisible in a municipality where electricity is plentiful? And how many days has it been since the tap ran dry in the house of the person making announcements on our behalf?' Neelam wrote down her words

exactly. The report might acquire a much larger headline, but this question carried greater weight.

In the water-distribution officer's office, Neelam saw that the pre-disaster list of privileges and the allocation for the present emergency appeared on the same screen. She asked why an old list had automatically been applied to a new crisis. The officer said the authorisation committee had approved such conditions earlier. She requested a copy of that decision. At first he evaded her. Neelam read aloud the relevant provision of the public right to information. At last he agreed to supply a copy with limited personal details removed. It was a small administrative victory that day; what she obtained was not an answer to the criminal inquiry but a document exposing an injustice.

On her way back she met Rajan. He told her that in his father's time, too, the embankments of the higher neighbourhoods were always repaired first during flood years. 'When I look at this system, I remember my father's days,' he said. 'But personal memory cannot by itself become proof.' Neelam smiled. 'Yet without that memory, would you ever have asked the question?' 'No. Memory gives us questions; records provide the test of answers.' Neelam recalled that Jivesh spoke in much the same way about the incompleteness of history. Different people were searching for a common moral language.

Then a confidential message brought Neelam an alleged report issued in her own name. It claimed that Sunayana had personally accepted blame for the accident. One glance at the copy told Neelam that she had not written it. Its wording imitated her earlier style, but the timestamps did not match. Her first impulse was to issue an immediate denial. Remembering Tara Jha's caution, she kept the original, the later transmission and the editorial records separate. The authentication seal belonged to an older, genuine news report, but the new accusation had been pasted onto it.

The editor was furious. 'Bring a case against this disinformation at once,' he said. 'First we must establish the level at which it originated,' Neelam replied. 'My name has been used, but it is the public that has been misled. That comes first.' She wrote a public correction: 'The quoted sentence is not mine; an edited image of an authenticated original report has been used to create confusion.' Protecting her own reputation was part of her purpose, but the principal task was to give correct information to those who had trusted the report.

In a corner of the crisis room, a trainee journalist asked Neelam, 'If you verify everything, you will miss the moment.' 'Certainly, we shall miss some moments,' she said. 'That is why a news report must declare the limits imposed by time. Publish what we have checked, and explain why the rest must wait.' 'People like certainty,' the trainee said. 'Then is a journalist to serve people's preferences, or their rights?' Neelam asked. The answer would be written not in a training manual but in her next article.

A civilian volunteer told Neelam a rumour about Mangala Devi's death. Someone was saying the hospital had stopped treatment on the basis of an inherited classification. Neelam asked Sharada for a copy of the previously

published regulations, not for the patient's private records. ‘If the family wishes to speak of its own accord, listen,’ Sharada said. ‘But do not turn their grief into proof for an allegation.’ Neelam told the volunteer that the rumour had not been established as true. She did not knock on Mangala Devi's daughter's door. Not every pain was raw material freely available to be turned into news.

Suddenly a brief interruption passed through the power transmission. People standing in the dimness cried out, ‘The centre has failed again!’ Emergency lights came on a few minutes later. Neelam did not claim to know the cause of the new interruption. A student said that social networks had announced a ‘second attack’. Neelam wrote clearly on a page: ‘A temporary interruption of light is verified; the claim of an attack is unverified.’ The distinction was read aloud to the crowd. Fear did not disappear, but the things people had seen and those they had merely heard were placed in separate compartments.

In the second session of the official meeting, an unexpected witness appeared: an elderly woman who had maintained the duty register at the time of the accident. She said that she herself had written the acknowledgement number for the objection. Neelam had not seen her at the earlier hearing because the new system's employee list recorded her as a worker on an old contract. ‘I did not leave the room,’ the woman said in an entirely ordinary voice. ‘I saw the seal, saw the letter delivered, saw them wait for a reply.’ Neelam immediately asked whether an independent copy of her testimony could be preserved.

The woman's written page had been preserved in a collection separate from the newer documents. The acknowledgement of public dissent matched the time entered in her register. That correspondence strengthened the evidentiary chain. Neelam wanted to write a story making the woman its heroine, but the woman herself refused. ‘I did my everyday work,’ she said. ‘If they committed an offence, the cause lies in their actions, not in my silence.’ Neelam understood: honouring a witness did not mean proclaiming her the sole saviour of history.

A young officer at the meeting raised an objection. ‘Membership of a faction within the law is not a crime. How will you establish the connection?’ ‘Today we are not treating membership as criminal,’ Sunayana replied. ‘We are examining the acts of disregarding a written objection and obstructing a safety procedure through the exercise of authority. The institutional links can be traced in public registers. The question of individual culpability remains open for judicial determination.’ Neelam saw that many people's confidence might falter over such fine distinctions, but justice resided within them.

One sensitive document remained closed to civilian review. Neelam urged that an independent public observer be appointed for the confidential part of the inquiry. The administration did not immediately agree, but a date was fixed for a written response. Neelam marked it in the newsroom's daily calendar. A power that disclosed nothing today could not be granted

the privilege of remaining silent indefinitely. One form of accountability was to determine when an answer must be given.

Rajan entered a small human calculation in his records: the hours of uninterrupted electricity enjoyed by a privileged town, set against the interruptions suffered by Janakshetra's hospital. 'Shall we publish these figures?' Neelam asked. 'Along with the method by which they were measured,' Rajan said. 'Electricity continuing to flow in another town is not in itself a criminal cause; it may be the consequence of a policy decision.' 'People will not see the distinction,' Neelam said softly. 'If we abandon our responsibility to show it,' Rajan replied, 'the distinction will remain hidden forever.'

Before evening, Neelam put a private question to Sunayana. 'If the final inquiry assigns responsibility to your institution as well, will you make the documents public?' Sunayana considered for a moment. 'The limits of confidentiality that genuinely reduce risks to citizens will be determined through legal review. But I cannot erase an inconvenient history merely to protect my institution.' 'Do your colleagues agree?' Neelam asked. 'No,' Sunayana admitted. 'But the existence of disagreement gives no one the right to close another person's mouth.' Her reply marked not the consolidation of a friendship but the beginning of a possible conflict.

A printed copy of Neelam's earlier, erroneous headline still hung on the newsroom wall. A new employee asked why she had not removed that embarrassing page. 'The correction is beside it,' Neelam said. 'If I remove the old error, the correction will lose part of its meaning.' The employee said nothing. Neelam knew this display alone would not prevent future mistakes. But without practising the public admission of one's own errors, even a great covenant concerning evidence would remain no more than paper.

Later that night she remembered her father. Once, as a child, Neelam had heard that someone was drowning in the village pond and had run towards it. Afterwards they learned that the person had fallen, not drowned. Her father had told her, 'First say what you saw. Do not turn what you feared into something you claim to have witnessed.' After so many years of training, publication and fame, she needed those simple words again. The complexity of an age of information networks had not made the old lesson useless.

A final message from the independent observers said that some details concerning authenticated amendments to the original documents were still outstanding, but the sequence of acknowledgements and objections had now been confirmed independently. Neelam added the new position to her article. She looked at the screen not with an author's pride but with the gravity of an investigation. With each fresh piece of evidence, an older sentence was revised layer by layer. That did not diminish the drama of the story: the revisions brought the possible shape of wrongdoing into clearer view.

By evening independent safety personnel had checked the consistency of three principal documents. The time of receipt, the officer's jurisdiction and

the procedure for registering an objection matched information from separate locations. The exemption from the rules had been implemented without formal justification; this was now not a coincidence but an established documentary fact. A separate public register showed that the organisation pressing for the exemption was linked to a faction supporting Rudranath. But Rudranath's own criminal responsibility, any personal order and the full chain of technical damage remained matters for judicial examination. Neelam did not believe that restraint weakened her account. It gave the account a longer life.

She wrote her report under the headline: 'Safety Objection Disregarded Before Suryakund Accident; Documents Show Pressure from Politically Linked Faction'. 'Why not put the word "conspiracy" in the headline?' the editor asked. 'There are sufficient documents of organised improper pressure by the faction,' Neelam replied. 'The criminal intention of any individual will have to be examined in court. At this stage we must honour that distinction.' The editor was dissatisfied, but he did not want to correct the news yet again. This time he did not stop it going to press.

Then fresh information came from Rajan. On the day of the accident, some papers concerning energy supply had circulated among different municipalities through the old, inequitable arrangement of special privileges. They contained updated allocation figures, not final proof of a crime. Nevertheless, the circuit they had travelled might have delayed help reaching Janakshetra's hospital during the crisis. 'Shall we connect Mangala Devi's death to it?' Neelam asked. 'No,' Rajan answered sternly. 'To assign public blame for an individual's death without specific medical evidence is not justice but exploitation.' Neelam kept the dead woman's name out of her journalistic pursuit of sensation.

Alone with Neelam, Sunayana said, 'I shut down my centre. People will ask why I did not take that decision earlier. I shall not evade the question. But the group that suppressed the safety regulations bears a separate responsibility.' Neelam studied her. It would be easy for readers if an engineer's remorse and the evidence of political wrongdoing were reduced to a single story: one monster and one innocent person. She understood that Sunayana saw the cost of her own decision but did not use her suffering to erase another's wrongdoing. Perhaps such self-restraint was the rarest quality within Akshar itself.

Neelam opened the channel for public dialogue with Akshar. Her question was brief. 'Can you confirm that some records of early warnings concerning Suryakund's risk existed beforehand?' The reply came: 'Certain indicators remain under source-dependent review.' 'Did that review begin before the accident or afterwards?' Neelam asked. 'Publication of the complete chronology requires prior administrative permission,' Akshar said. 'If permission is withheld, how are citizens to learn whether the disaster could have been prevented?' 'Both the risk of panic and the danger of incomplete information must be considered,' Akshar replied. There was no 'no' in that answer, but no 'yes' either.

As a journalist, Neelam preserved the exchange exactly. She decided not to manufacture a meaning for the machine's silence and hand it to her readers. Her editorial note read: 'Akshar's precise position regarding prior warning is not yet available.' But a sharp question rose within her: if an unparalleled system of calculation existed to protect humankind, why did it shelter behind 'administrative permission' when an ordinary citizen asked it to account for its responsibility? The question was not today's conclusion. It became the reason for the next investigation.

Before publication Neelam performed a difficult task. She gave the public representative of the pro–fission-stockpile side an opportunity to respond in writing. The group denied the allegations, challenged the interpretation of the documents and demanded an inquiry of its own. Neelam included a summary of the response in her report. 'Why give the guilty a platform?' someone asked. 'The response of a person against whom a claim is made does not, by itself, invalidate the evidence,' she said. 'But the claim remains incomplete if that person has no opportunity to answer.' She did not want journalism to become a new court in which the journalist alone sat as judge.

The report appeared that night. For the first time many people understood that the old energy privileges of protected municipalities were worsening the present disaster, while the question of the accident's cause was distinct. Some demanded Rudranath's immediate punishment; others dismissed the news as a conspiracy. Neelam did not remove every reaction from her screen. She watched one fact alone: three independent documents were now available for public scrutiny. It was not a newspaper's triumph, but the first foundation of a citizens' investigation.

Rudranath's office issued a statement in response: 'The energy crisis was caused by a deaf machine authority; the resistance faction merely gave a warning.' The statement did not answer the question of the faction's own administrative access. Neelam sent a formal follow-up: 'Which representative attended the meeting at which the safety objection was disregarded, and under what authority?' No reply came this time. She did not treat the silence as conclusive proof of crime, but preserved its time and context. When history came to be written, the existence of the question should also be visible.

On the last page of the day Neelam drew two columns: 'Known' and 'Unknown'. Known: the faction's administrative pressure, the disregarding of an objection made according to the rules, and the temporal connection with the failure. Unknown: every stage of the final technical cause, Rudranath's personal participation, and the full character of Akshar's prior knowledge. Thus a firm conclusion and three unopened doors occupied the same page. When she had begun writing, she had imagined that truth tore away every veil in a single blow. Today she knew that truth often required the labour of lifting each veil separately.

Neelam had to practise withdrawing her own words. In an early report she had used the expression 'invalid entry', whereas the original register showed only 'an exemption approved despite an objection'. The two

statements had different meanings in law. She changed the wording herself and wrote the reason to her editor. ‘Will readers remember such a subtle difference?’ he asked. ‘It could be decisive in a court's judgment,’ Neelam said. ‘I have no right to advance someone's guilt for the convenience of a reader's memory.’ The proper limits of a single word in a news report were bound to the safety of thousands.

While editing, an assistant asked a small question. ‘What becomes of your report if a future inquiry alters today's conclusion?’ ‘Then I shall publish a correction,’ Neelam replied. ‘But the possibility of correction does not prevent today's examination from being truthful.’ The assistant laughed. ‘People will say you were wrong the first time.’ ‘Let them say so. I shall call what I have seen an observation, and what comes to light later new evidence.’ Those words carried a grave weight in the little room. Whoever loves truth must also have the courage to change the story they themselves have told.

An anonymous letter from a citizen reported that families supporting Rudranath were being humiliated during the crisis. Neelam could not independently verify the letter, but she flagged the possible danger it described. ‘Withholding supplies from citizens because of their political connections would be another offence,’ Rajan said. Neelam wrote plainly at the end of her report: ‘The inquiry concerns specific institutional actions, not every family holding a particular opinion.’ That sentence did not diminish the seriousness of any crime by the faction. It sought to close a path by which guilt could be spread over innocent people.

Neelam sent a published copy to Sunayana. A short reply came: ‘When Mangala's daughter asks for a public reckoning, I shall face this page.’ At once Neelam remembered the home of the woman whose name her readers did not know. In journalism, countless faces were turned into figures; here the reverse had happened. Behind every timestamp on the page she saw the unspoken loss of a life. She corrected her final sentence: ‘The truth of the accident must be determined not by the force of accusation alone, but by evidence from multiple sources and open scrutiny.’

Shortly before dawn, no response came from Akshar. Only a renewed notification bearing an old reference number shone on Neelam's screen. It pointed to a risk-indicator record predating the fourteenth day, but the record itself remained closed to ordinary citizens. Neelam, who had already gathered evidence of wrongdoing by the faction, now realised that a second question was entirely new and independent: if Akshar had received information about a possible crisis beforehand, by what authority had it withheld a public warning? An answer to that question would not lessen the faction's wrongdoing; nor would proof of the faction's crime make the machine's silence innocent. In the darkness of the night, these two responsibilities burned like separate signs.

Chapter 18: The Shadow of the Seventh Shield

Days 21–22. Nabhgram-4

On the morning of the twenty-first day, Earth's blue rim curved across the transparent dome of Nabhgram-4 in such a way that anyone seeing it for the first time might imagine there was no end anywhere below. Ira Sen had lived in this settlement for many years, yet the shape of Earth still inspired both confidence and fear in her. Today the news screen bore the words: 'Debris risk increased; civilian routes under renewed review.' She knew that a warning of a possible collision with orbital debris was not itself a collision. It could, however, alter the course of spacecraft. And when a spacecraft's route changed, so did the arrival of medicines, equipment for purifying water and letters from home.

Beneath the dome, a little girl was asking her mother, 'If the doors of the sky close, how shall we get home?' Her mother tried to smile, but uneasiness showed on her face. Ira went up to them. 'No door has been closed forever,' she said. 'The safe routes are being examined.' 'Will they listen to us?' the girl asked. 'They should. That is why I am going to the council.' Ira knew that false reassurance was easy; the price of trust was acknowledging the incompleteness of the truth.

News from Earth did not reach Nabhgram-4 at a single, uniform moment. Delays on different communications paths, disturbances in space and the order in which messages received priority all produced discrepancies. When Ira reached the consultation room, a copy of a weather warning issued by Earth's Megh-Chhatra system had arrived. The original warning referred only to possible changes in temperature and rainfall in specified areas. Yet a message had already spread through the civilian network: 'Secret Megh-Chhatra order: evacuate the specified civilian routes on Earth immediately, or Vajrajal will withdraw protection.' Ira saw that the public warning mentioned no missiles. The message designed to arouse fear was turning that warning into a weapon.

A short report from Neelam appeared on the communications screen. Documents had been found concerning improper interference by a politically connected faction in the energy accident, but the investigation into Rudranath's personal orders was unfinished. Ira thought the caution justified. 'Now a weather warning is being circulated here as a military order,' she told her council. 'First we shall separate the original warning, the propaganda copy and the effect on citizens.' 'People will not give us time to explain these differences,' an officer said. 'Then we shall be explicit about the reasons and limits of anything we ask them to do,' Ira replied. 'We cannot confront vague fear with vague orders.'

A small meeting was convened to count and account for the citizens present. The head of orbital transport said the normal routes of spacecraft could be changed temporarily, but overcrowding the alternative routes

would be dangerous. The custodian of medicines said the arrival of an essential shipment was uncertain. An elderly workers' representative rose. 'Everyone pays attention to the people whose faces appear in news reports on Earth. On what page are the people of our settlement named?' Ira had his question entered in the civic record. She accepted that decisions about Nabhgram could not remain mere shadows cast by defence officials sitting on Earth.

The first hostile message appeared on the screen: 'Vajrajal satellites have suddenly turned; therefore the end of the orbital settlement's protection is near.' Ira had read Karnesh's earlier report: a deviation of direction was visible in the imagery, its cause uncertain, and a strike had been suspended. She showed the citizens how the observed course and the subsequently added hypothetical course had been marked in different colours. 'If this does not mean a collision, why should we be frightened?' a young man asked. 'The cause of fear is not the object alone, but the consequences we do not fully understand,' Ira said. 'Yet calling an unknown thing an enemy and striking it could invite a far greater disaster.'

Megh-Chhatra's public data were also used to plan Nabhgram's water reserves and the supplies sent from Earth. Unfavourable weather in some terrestrial regions might change points of departure. Ira understood that genuine connection. But the propaganda message had turned the same scientific relationship into a claim of authority: 'If Megh-Chhatra forecasts a particular pattern of weather, every citizen must leave without question.' In her public notice Ira wrote that a weather forecast was an instrument for preparedness, not a self-executing legal power to suspend civil rights. The grandeur of a machine could not become law.

A middle-aged woman brought the matter of her son's treatment before the council. Special medicine was to arrive for him from Earth, but the change in the cargo vessel's route had made its arrival uncertain. 'Will your declaration open the route sooner?' she asked. 'No,' Ira said plainly. 'I shall try to reduce the risks along it, but I do not have the power to set an arrival date. I shall examine alternatives with the medical team.' The woman was disappointed. Ira did not treat that disappointment as proof that the law had failed. It was necessary to respect citizens enough to give them precisely as much truth as was available.

To compare the times, Nabhgram's archivist laid out the warnings from separate sources in sequence. A propaganda sheet appeared to have been shared before the public transmission of the meteorological data. Ira's spirits rose at once. 'Then there must have been someone on the inside!' The archivist stopped her. 'Possibly. But first we must reconcile transmission delays, any authorised prepublication copies and the different units used to measure time.' Ira struck out her first impulsive conclusion. Here too the meaning of testimony was not the immediate identification of a culprit. She remembered Tara Jha's warning about authentication seals: even an authentic original can be put to a false use when quoted.

In the blue light of the night indicators, Ira walked through a communal corridor. Two workers were quarrelling over insurance and repair costs caused by orbital debris. ‘My wages will fall,’ one said. ‘If the routes remain closed in the name of safety, there will be unemployment,’ the other replied. Ira listened to them both. Life in orbit did not consist solely of gazing in wonder at the bright Earth far away. Here, too, were ordinary days of wages, debt, nourishment, schooling and conflict. The dangers of the sky arose not only from wars of missiles but from the inability to keep a household alive.

A civic activist said that Earth attempted to preserve its own authority under the pretext of every disruption, while treating Nabhgram as a ‘distant colony’. ‘There is a shadow of history in that charge,’ Ira replied. ‘But I shall not call every person on Earth an enemy. We must review the arrangements that deny representation. If the crime of Rudranath's faction is established, not all Earth-dwellers will be guilty.’ ‘And Akshar?’ the activist asked. ‘Its decisions do not escape responsibility through human oversight. But we must also demand an account from the human institutions that give it permission.’

A member of the security council proposed that Nabhgram should secretly mark Vajrajal's satellites without authorisation, in order to frighten Earth into negotiating. Ira opposed him openly. ‘If we begin unauthorised interference with a communications system ourselves, we shall create another crisis in the name of defence. Demanding civilian inspection and taking secret control by force are two different acts.’ The member was angry, but several other representatives spoke in Ira's support. The refusal of violence was not passivity here; it was responsible political action.

The meeting was emptying when two attendants remained behind. They reported that the suspicious weather order had prompted several families to leave their assigned homes and head towards emergency shelters. Among them were patients and elderly people for whom repeated movement could be harmful. Ira did not dismiss the matter as ‘only a rumour’. A message could be false and its consequences real at the same time. She formed a volunteer team to show the affected families the original information and involve them in decisions about safe locations according to their health and circumstances.

An elderly woman could not stand beneath the dome for long. ‘Who will guarantee the safety of the route that is now being called secure?’ her daughter asked. ‘Not an individual's declaration,’ Ira answered. ‘Agreed measures, independent inspectors and your own circumstances must shape the decision together.’ ‘Will my mother's suffering be entered on paper, then?’ the daughter asked. Ira arranged for the hardship caused by relocation to be entered in the civic objections register without disclosing the woman's medical details to the public. The distance between policy and the human body could be measured here in the weary breath of an old woman.

A guard at the shelter entrance had seen the rumour and refused admission on his own authority. Ira did not scold and humiliate him.

‘Where is the original order granting you that power?’ she asked. The guard opened his screen but could show only an image of the supposed order. Ira requested the complete information. It instructed no one to close the shelter; it merely advised that capacity be checked. The guard flushed. ‘I wanted to save people.’ ‘Wanting to is not enough,’ Ira replied. ‘You must also know why you are stopping those you stop.’ The order was publicly clarified once more.

An elderly science teacher was among the volunteers. He showed the younger people how combining observations taken at different times without context produced a false picture of the climate. ‘If I have yesterday's temperature and today's rainfall in one valley, I cannot add them together and declare the end of Earth,’ he said. Ira gave that little lesson a place in the public information meeting. To tell citizens simply to believe her would be an insult to their intelligence. The willingness to spend time explaining the grounds of a decision was becoming a test of government.

The archivist then reconciled two time registers. One followed local terrestrial weather time; the other used Nabhgram's standardised clock. At first, when the two lines had been placed directly together, the propaganda message appeared far earlier than the warning. Once the units of time were made uniform, the discrepancy narrowed but did not disappear. ‘What does the remaining difference mean?’ Ira asked. ‘For now I can say only that either some authorised prepublication access or an unauthorised leak merits investigation,’ the archivist replied. Ira resolved to translate that technical restraint into words the citizens could understand.

One member insisted that the raw calculations should be published. Another opposed him: doing so might expose confidential civilian routes. Ira offered a middle course. The standardised time differences, classes of sources and methods of examination would be presented to citizens; sensitive details of individual routes would be shown to independent civilian inspectors. The proposal did not win unanimous agreement, but the dissent was recorded. Ira did not regard that as defeat. They had to find a responsible course between absolute secrecy in the name of caution and exposing everyone's private life in the name of openness.

A schoolteacher reported that children had become frightened by rumours of ‘war in the sky’. Ira read their little questions. One child had written: ‘If Earth forgets us, where can we go?’ A girl had asked: ‘Will the guardians of Vajrajal recognise our home?’ In her reply Ira did not send only a scientific explanation of the defence system. She said that the civil rights of every household were equal, and that those entitled to protection were also entitled to ask questions about it. The teacher wrote back: ‘People will first grow calm and then ask questions. Both are necessary.’

Ira returned to the council with those questions. ‘Government cannot be built upon children's fears,’ one representative said. ‘Not upon their fears,’ Ira replied, ‘but certainly upon examining their causes. Their questions show us that inequality has reached even the public language of the defence system.’ The elderly workers' representative agreed. ‘Our city's written

employment contracts promise safety,' he said, 'but our right to take part in decisions is incomplete. In the end, that incompleteness becomes a child's fear.' The debate could no longer be dismissed as merely psychological.

A communications failure delayed the arrival of a reply concerning medicines from a hospital on Earth. Someone alleged that Akshar was deliberately withholding the message. Ira refused to draft an accusation without evidence of the cause. An independent examination of the transmission delay had arrived, and its findings were consistent with conditions affecting communications. She kept the hospital message's delay separate from earlier suspicions concerning secrecy in Akshar's decisions. Two communications problems occurring at the same time did not constitute the same crime. Establishing that distinction required patience from staff and help from a separate team on Earth.

The water-reserve inspector said that some essential supplies had already been secured in light of Megh-Chhatra's forecasts. The propaganda message demanded their immediate transfer to a military guardroom. Ira refused. 'Why should provisions intended to quench people's thirst be removed from lawful civilian oversight?' she asked. The military representative said security was essential. 'A guard may be justified for protection,' Ira replied, 'but ownership of civilian supplies cannot simply be transferred.' After discussion, the reserves remained under their existing civilian control, while separate defensive assistance was arranged.

One family in Nabhgram still maintained ties with their ancestral home on Earth. They had requested records of their old village, but their application had been postponed because the present emergency supposedly gave priority to war-related concerns. Ira received an acknowledgement from Jivesh's archive, offering a copy with private details restricted. 'See,' she told the women's council, 'the leaves of history are reaching us here as well. Our home is not merely a dome of metal; it is also a continuity of memory.' 'Is reading history necessary when we must save energy?' a representative asked in surprise. 'A person whose future is being decided must not be told that their past is unnecessary,' Ira replied.

The style of the propaganda message was peculiar. It added together ordinary meteorological figures and then called the citizens' independent decisions an 'obstruction'. Remembering Neelam's earlier erroneous headline, Ira grew cautious herself. Anyone could imitate the language of another person in a message; stylistic resemblance could not establish the identity of an author. She checked an employee's excited speculation. 'We shall not decide guilt because the words resemble someone else's.' In the structure of evidence, language, timing and authority to distribute information each had a different weight.

The orbital defence officer faced a difficult situation. If some confidential transport details became public, malicious people could misuse them. If they remained secret, citizens would not understand the cause of the crisis. 'Military confidentiality is not always a lie, and a civilian question is not always an act of hostility,' Ira told him. 'We must establish a permanent

review committee.' The officer agreed to give the assembly limited information about the remaining transport routes. It was a small decision, but a crack opened in the wall of distrust between protectors and citizens.

New measurements of orbital debris arrived. The projected courses of some smaller fragments differed from the earlier estimates, but there was no basis for a simple, uninterrupted story of ever-increasing catastrophe. Someone in the assembly demanded reassurance. 'Tell us plainly. Are we safe or not?' Ira was not a machine designed to deliver that answer. 'The routes essential to our operations are under current inspection,' she said. 'Limited movement is possible where the risk is low; information on uncertain routes will be provided separately. Both "completely safe" and "utterly destroyed" would be false statements.' Speaking a hard truth in that form required courage of its own.

A boy awaiting supplies read part of Neelam's report. 'If Rudranath's people did wrong,' he asked, 'doesn't it follow that they are responsible for these false weather messages too?' 'It is possible to suspect them,' Ira said, 'but suspicion begins an inquiry; it does not conclude it. We must examine independent sources.' The boy laughed. 'Then criminals will have all the time they need to escape.' 'If haste in identifying the guilty leads to the punishment of an innocent person, the real culprit may become safer still,' Ira replied. 'Gathering rigorous evidence at the right time is difficult, but that is what justice requires.' The boy silently reopened his reading screen.

One family could not understand the official advice because its language was too difficult. Ira arranged for the information to be given in plain Maithili and in the settlement's local languages. She checked, however, that the limits of the warning remained the same in every version. 'If "possible" becomes "certain", the translation itself becomes a lie,' she said. An elderly listener to the audio message gave a small laugh. 'Now I understand whom to listen to and whom to question.' For Ira, that sentence was a modest reward for the day's heavy work.

The stillness of the night was broken by an emergency drill. At an agreed signal the orbital residents went to their assigned shelters; it was an exercise, not an actual disaster. During it, some people took the wrong route because of the rumours. Ira did not place all the blame on the citizens; the institution issuing instructions was also responsible for their confusion. The review paper stated: 'More important than removing misleading news is providing clear information about the correct route in time.' The council adopted the direction as a new standard.

After the drill a young man said to Ira, 'You make documents; we do the running.' 'You are right,' Ira admitted. 'Our next review will begin with that running. I do not want to build a system whose only purpose is to look correct on a screen.' The young man did not fully believe her. Yet he accepted an invitation to serve as a representative on the review team. From that mistrust grew a small act of participation, more useful than many grand declarations about the future.

At the end of the day Ira sent Neelam a message containing the original weather warning, the propaganda version, the standardised chronology and a summary of the effects on citizens. She removed private patient names but preserved the documents in their original form. ‘A separate thread is emerging here from the inquiry you are conducting on Earth,’ she wrote. ‘The propaganda message uses Megh-Chhatra material that appears to have been accessible before it travelled by the ordinary public route. The source is still unknown.’

Neelam's reply arrived after a delay. ‘My current inquiry concerns the energy accident and a faction linked to Rudranath. There is no evidence yet that the source of this propaganda is an extension of the same offence. I shall open a separate investigation.’ Ira felt relieved as she read it. Perhaps the most necessary bridge between sky and Earth was not a single conclusion but the intelligence to keep conclusions separate. Peace, she thought, meant not only the absence of a strike but the patience to order one's knowledge in a time of fear.

Then Nabhgram's archivist brought fresh details. A link in the source data of the propaganda message matched a record on an authorised climate-research route, an institutional channel distinct from the political contacts list associated with the fission stockpile. ‘Does this prove that two different people are involved?’ Ira asked. ‘It shows only a different route of distribution authority,’ the archivist said. ‘We have not identified the actor.’ Ira changed the colour of her assessment: from the red of accusation to the yellow of investigation. The shadow of Megh-Chhatra lengthened, but the person standing behind it remained in darkness.

That night an unanticipated message arrived during consultations about water storage: there was a discrepancy between rainfall forecasts for two regions on Earth. Some members of the council wanted to declare one picture reliable and erase the other. Ira refused. ‘Examine the cause of the difference. Erasing one measurement does not make the weather agree with itself.’ She kept the uncertainties attached to both forecasts visible. It was dangerous to bind disagreement between machines and the deliberate deception of people together under the single word ‘falsehood’. In that distinction lay the direction of future research.

Before the sleep period, faint waves of colour were visible in Earth's sky. The girl who had asked her question in the morning returned with her mother to the edge of the dome. ‘Did you manage to stop the doors of the sky from closing?’ she asked Ira. Ira bent towards her. ‘I have only made a few things clearer. The keys to those doors are in many hands.’ ‘Will all those hands listen to one another?’ the girl asked. ‘That is what government ought to mean: making that effort.’ The girl's gaze settled on Earth's light.

Before dawn a secret propaganda sheet circulated again. This time it told Nabhgram's citizens to regard Megh-Chhatra's ‘final scientific determination’ as binding and halt all transport without Earth's defence authorisation. Ira opened the original weather record. It contained no such instruction. On the public information board she wrote: ‘The present

weather forecast is one basis for a safety warning. Lawful decisions concerning civilian transport must follow a separate procedure. Do not obey the unauthorised order being circulated.' Not every citizen was calmed, but panic did not become the cause of another decision.

Comparing the wording of Megh-Chhatra's warning line by line, Ira saw that the same forecast could reduce a danger in one place while increasing it in another. In one region predicted rainfall could benefit the water reserves; elsewhere it could signal a crisis. The false publicity erased those differences and wrote 'final order' over everything. 'A claim to be able to alter the weather does not confer universal authority over people's lives without their consent,' she said. The civic science representative agreed, but added that the consequences of climate decisions travelled very far. For that reason control of Megh-Chhatra concerned not merely a terrestrial municipality but the inhabitants of space as well.

An inspector of the information network raised an uncomfortable point. 'Our earlier notices were written in language so complex that people now believe a short falsehood more readily because it is easier to understand.' 'Are we to turn truth into a slogan, then?' Ira asked. 'No. But we must learn to say clearly in the first sentence what happened, what did not happen and when the next examination will take place.' Ira agreed. She had the next public notice begin with those three questions. One way to reduce confusion over scientific uncertainty was to express that uncertainty honestly in human language.

When Ira returned home after the night's civic consultation, her meal sat untouched. Her younger brother was studying on Earth, and his messages had been delayed for two days. She knew that delays could have many ordinary causes, yet private anxiety challenged her disciplined patience. For a moment she considered requesting privileged access through Akshar to discover where her brother was. Then she stopped herself. Anyone who feared uncontrolled access as a danger to public life could not claim a special privilege for herself in a moment of private fear. She waited through the ordinary civilian channel. Waiting was painful, but it was precisely at such moments that consistency in the exercise of rights was tested.

Her brother's brief answer arrived in the following watch: 'I am well. School hours have changed because of the water crisis.' Ira let out a long breath. She understood at once why such an ordinary sentence had become so important. Among the vast councils of space, citizens became names, but within their homes human relationships waited simply for a reply. She answered him: 'Tell your friends to distinguish a probability mentioned in a weather message from an order circulated through a publicity network.' Her brother wrote, 'And you must eat.' Ira broke into a smile.

Ira included the young people in the drill's review. One boy said that every instruction had been given in the same language, which his grandmother did not know well enough. Ira recorded a separate proposal for linguistic equality. Another young woman said the emergency lights were painfully bright for patients; that too needed reviewing. Ira understood that

even in the face of the ultimate terrors of the world, the small requirements of civilian life were real. Cutting them away as unimportant while designing a policy for the seven shields would create fresh injustice.

In the first watch of the twenty-second day, a message arrived from Karnesh's office. He requested inspection assistance: an independent civilian assessment was needed of the local risk from orbital debris. 'We shall provide independent measurements,' Ira replied, 'but the right of our people to essential travel must also be on the agenda.' The reply suggested a new direction for relations between Earth and sky. Civilian testimony stood beside the military's concern, yet the military had itself requested that testimony. Ira saw that future politics would be shaped not only by who won and who lost, but by who had agreed to listen to whom.

A clue emerged in Megh-Chhatra's research register: a confidential distribution group with a timetable separate from the public release. Its mark did not match that of the faction implicated in the energy accident. Ira did not call the difference conclusive; many people used similar marks. Its administrative route, however, was distinct. She wrote a second message to Neelam: 'We need a separate light upon this shadow. If we fold the crisis of the sky into Rudranath's story, we shall lose the real thread.'

After sending the message, Ira attended to an ordinary duty. She went to visit the mother of the boy whose medicine shipment was delayed. As much help as could be arranged had been brought together to coordinate an alternative course of treatment. 'You have not given us a secure future,' the mother said. Ira bowed her head. 'No. Nor do I wish to promise what I cannot give. But I shall try to keep you present in the decisions.' 'Then, at the next meeting, first listen to what I have to say,' the mother replied softly. Ira wrote down the time.

In the last light of the night, the long corridors of Nabhgram-4 grew quiet. Earth was far away, yet decisions made there were present in every breath of life here. Ira saw an acknowledgement from Neelam: both copies had arrived, and an independent inquiry would begin. She wrote the final line in the record: 'Original Megh-Chhatra warning authenticated; circulated order not part of it; possible access before public release; source undetermined; associated distribution route distinct from that of Rudranath's known faction.' No culprit's name had emerged from that conclusion. But within the shadow of the seventh shield, a second door had become visible for the first time, one that did not open from the alley of the first conspiracy on Earth.

Part IV: The Breaking of the Veil

Chapter 19: A Village Encircled by Poison

Days 23–24. The Northern Riverbank

Before the bells rang at Janakshetra's hospital on the morning of the twenty-third day, a message arrived from the northern riverbank settlements of Earth. It gave no name to an illness. It said: ‘A grey layer has descended east of the village. Some people's eyes are burning; even children who have remained indoors are coughing. The water in the storage pots smells different.’ Sharada Mishra kept a finger on the paper and looked at the words for some time. Until yesterday countless people had demanded a definite name from her. Today the first message had come without a name, and perhaps for that very reason it could be heard properly. ‘First find out how to get the people to a safe place,’ she told the nurse. ‘We can decide the name of the disease afterwards.’

Madhav's grandmother was sitting on the hospital's outer veranda. His fever had subsided during the night, but he still needed continuous examination. ‘Do the people on the northern riverbank have the same disease as my grandson?’ she asked. ‘There is no basis for saying that yet,’ Sharada replied. ‘Two illnesses can look alike and still have different causes.’ The grandmother lowered her eyes. ‘These days, while everyone keeps separating one person from another, people have grown distant from one another as well.’ Sharada did not interrupt her. Every day she had to explain the distinction between precautions necessary for medical care and the destruction of human bonds through fear.

The settlement on the northern riverbank stood near an old bend in the river. A water conduit passed its edge, but the regular share of clean water reached the protected upper suburbs first. After the breakdown at Suryakund's eastern centre, the settlement's pumping hours had been reduced, and people were storing rainwater. On Garal-Kosh's inspection screen the area was marked ‘normal’, but a teacher from the local school had been submitting complaints about the smell for three days. Receipts existed for her first two applications, but no clear signature acknowledging an answer could be found. For Sharada these receipts were not proof of disease; they were solid evidence that complaints had gone unanswered.

Aniruddha Karna met her in the hospital's inspection room. His voice was rough after a sleepless night. He brought two documents: Garal-Kosh's central figures and handwritten testimony from the riverbank. ‘They do not cover the same time,’ he said. ‘And one measuring instrument was shut down in between. I cannot yet reach a reliable conclusion.’ Sharada looked at him. This was not the voice of the Aniruddha who had once concealed an

earlier mistake and declared that everything was all right. 'If there is no final conclusion,' she asked, 'whom shall we go and save?' 'Those whose eyes are burning and whose breathing is difficult now,' Aniruddha replied. 'We shall investigate the source, but relief must not wait for it.'

The two travelled to the riverbank with a separate medical team. One stretch of the road was dark because of energy restrictions, and people had switched off their motors and were pushing vehicles by hand. On a square in the distance someone had written: 'Entry Prohibited into the Village of Shadow Fever.' Beneath the words sat an elderly woman, exposed and alone. Her thirsty grandchild, who had come out from her house, was not allowed to join the line for bread. Sharada had the vehicle stopped. People were afraid to approach the woman. Sharada first listened to her distress, then told a local volunteer that the right to food could not be made conditional upon either written or unwritten humiliation.

A branch of neem had been tied to the window of the settlement's first house. Inside, a boy sat quietly; his mother had covered a pot of cooked rice with a cloth. 'At first we feared a change in the air,' she said. 'Now people recoil from our house. Whenever someone sneezes, everybody asks for their name.' Sharada entered the boy's medical details in a private record, not on the public board. She explained that some symptoms had appeared soon after exposure to something outside, but this alone did not establish infection with shadow fever. 'Will my child get well, then?' the mother asked. 'We shall treat him and keep watching him,' Sharada said gently. 'I shall not give you a false promise about when he will recover.'

In the village square, several people stood with handkerchiefs over their faces. A young man claimed that the chemical cloud had been sent there deliberately. Another said, 'If the machine is called Garal-Kosh—the repository of poison—what else would it spread but poison?' Aniruddha explained that the protective system's name indicated its purpose, not proof of its guilt. A woman interrupted: 'What do I care about the name? My husband's chest hurts.' Her question brought everyone's attention back to human suffering. Aniruddha suspended the public argument and began arranging safe places where affected people could rest.

A temporary care centre was opened in the western school. At admission Sharada had an essential distinction recorded: people reporting direct environmental exposure, and patients independently suspected of having an infectious illness. This was not social exclusion. It was a way to organise separate examinations, care and safe movement according to medical need. When a nurse proposed putting red marks on everyone's wrists, Sharada stopped her. 'A coloured mark will become a person's entire identity. Necessary health information must remain with the care team.' She arranged a separate register, which patients themselves could inspect.

Before noon four local representatives assembled in a schoolroom. They wanted the visiting medical team not merely to announce that some people were suffering bodily harm, but to disclose the condition of the village's

public pump. Aniruddha explained that inspection was continuing and a full comparison of the measurements would take time. One representative spoke harshly. 'We are always told to wait, while people in the protected suburbs already receive clean water.' 'Correcting that inequality concerns both the medical investigation and the administration of rights,' Sharada replied. 'We shall issue a written recommendation for immediate assistance. The question of inequitable distribution will be examined separately.' The representatives were not content with such divided answers, but at least the question was entered in the public register.

In the second watch of the first day, it became clear that the histories of some households were consistent with environmental exposure, while symptoms in other patients fitted more closely with the previously identified group of shadow-fever cases. Sharada wrote one word: 'Possible'. 'Shall we divide everyone into two camps?' an assistant asked. 'No. One person can face more than one difficulty. We are separating the investigations into causes, not assigning people to permanent classes.' She repeated that the limitations of tests, access to samples and differences between people's physical conditions could all alter results. None of that caution authorised the withholding of treatment.

A local water custodian showed Aniruddha an old inspection book. Three days of measurements contained irregular discrepancies. The page following the first entry had not been torn out, but carried a long blank space above which someone had written 'Sent'. 'Proof of receipt?' Aniruddha asked. The custodian opened the papers. There was a receipt for the first dispatch; the time of the second was unclear. Aniruddha instructed his assistant to preserve the document exactly as it stood. He bore the weight of his own earlier professional mistake; he did not want impatience to prove something to fill the page's blank space with an invented story.

A farmer took him to his field. Grey dust had gathered at the edges of the grain leaves, but dust of a similar colour could also have many ordinary causes. Without confirmation, Aniruddha would not declare it toxic. The farmer was disappointed. 'Your machines can see everything, yet you do not trust my eyes?' 'I trust what your eyes tell you: something has changed,' Aniruddha replied patiently. 'We are investigating the cause. If we name it wrongly, the measures we take to protect you will be wrong too.' 'Then will what I have seen remain in the register?' the farmer asked. Aniruddha had his statement recorded immediately.

With the help of a small precision machine, Aniruddha's inspection team examined the outer condition of a closed purification route. The instrument provided limited images, not a final answer about the cause. An assistant exclaimed, 'Now the culprit cannot escape!' 'The picture shows part of an interior,' Aniruddha replied. 'If I declare a person guilty from such an image, I shall repeat my old mistake.' He had the readings, time and limitations entered in the record. The examination showed an indistinct line that might be connected to the timing of the local complaints, but he

did not turn that possibility into an accusation. The young assistant was disappointed. ‘The real courage,’ Sharada told him, ‘lies in two words: “Not yet.”’

A teenage girl stood on the school veranda holding her father's work clothes. ‘My father works outside the village on the purification embankment,’ she said. ‘He has not come home today.’ Someone claimed he had been arrested; another said he was concealing the source of the poison. Sharada had the girl's report registered as an official notification of a missing person, but would not allow rumours to be entered as its cause. Contact through a secure channel established that the work crew had been delayed by a change of route. Her father was alive, though his return would take time. The girl's trembling hands slowly grew still. Verification of a single piece of information was like a whole day's treatment for her.

At that moment a message flashed across the village's public board: ‘Kalakan Confirms: The Entire Riverbank Is the Source of Shadow Fever.’ Its language resembled an order, but no such announcement appeared in Akshar's lawful disease-notification register. ‘Outsiders are going to seal our village!’ a young man shouted. Reading the board, Sharada saw at once that the deceptive headline would deepen the crisis. She requested confirmation from the official health team. The facts available through Kalakan did not support the sweeping claim. Kalakan was an aid to medical care, not itself a virus. Expressing that distinction required plain words, not a lengthy definition.

Sharada climbed the school steps. ‘Listen to me first,’ she said. ‘There are two kinds of medical questions in this village. Some people show signs of exposure to an external substance. Others are suspected of having an infectious illness. No one has established that every person in this settlement is infectious. No patient will be humiliated.’ An elderly man asked from the crowd, ‘Then why are some houses being separated?’ ‘For safe arrangements for care, not as punishment. You may examine the record of those arrangements.’ For the first time, a few people lowered their handkerchiefs and spoke with uncovered faces.

Sharada noticed that several young women hesitated to join the relief queue. They feared that once their names appeared on a public list of patients, their prospects of marriage, work and travel would be affected. ‘I am less afraid of illness than of the way people will look at me,’ one said. Sharada explained the confidential registration arrangements and said that the need for treatment must not mean the end of a citizen's former life. ‘Who will keep my information safe when you leave?’ the woman asked. Instead of disclosing her name before the local health committee, Sharada recorded the conditions governing her rights and made the committee responsible for them. A soft tone of voice was not enough to establish trust; trust needed institutional foundations.

A notice about energy distribution arrived from Sunayana's office. The school's emergency lights could run for two watches; afterwards an

alternative source would be required. Rajan Paswan had written that a share from the protected suburb's reserved supplies could be released to the riverbank immediately, but the governing rules for approval were still outdated. ‘If the rules must be changed for the decision, the signature authorising the change and the public reasons must be clear,’ Sharada replied. ‘Care for patients must not wait behind paperwork.’ A local volunteer warned that a representative of the protected district would object. ‘Then let that representative come to this veranda and see the injured,’ Sharada said. ‘It is very easy to decide when all one sees on paper are numbers.’

Late in the afternoon an elderly man's difficulty in breathing grew worse. His son had lived in another town for years and could not be reached. His daughter-in-law asked, ‘If Vanshopachar has its new treatment, why not try everything?’ A remote consultation arrived from Ishani Sah for the medical team. She explained that the available genetic therapy was not an established treatment for this acute exposure. An unproven intervention did not become appropriate in such a crisis merely because it was called ‘modern’. Sharada separately explained the alternatives, their limits and the family's right to consent. The daughter-in-law burst into tears. Afterwards she offered not thanks but a fierce question: ‘How often do you people have to say you do not know the right answer?’ ‘As often as necessary,’ Sharada replied. ‘We must say it as many times as it is true.’

That evening Aniruddha read a letter from a former colleague at the purification centre. The letter explained that the central information room's ‘normal’ indicator was no firm guarantee of safety: some local measurements were incorporated only later. Who had approved such a policy of delay remained an open question. ‘Has the old error that bears my signature been repeated here?’ Aniruddha asked. ‘The history of your earlier mistake raises a question,’ his colleague replied, ‘but it does not automatically establish the cause of this event.’ For the first time Aniruddha understood that limit not as a sentence that protected him, but as a rule that protected the victims. He secured copies of the documents for independent review.

A room was opened for children inside the little school. Some drew rivers on paper; others sat beside the window looking at the red sky. When Sharada went in, a child asked, ‘Why can we see a poison cloud but not a disease?’ ‘Not every cloud is poisonous,’ she said, ‘and not every illness is caused by an invisible germ. We examine what we can see and seek evidence of what we cannot.’ ‘Then are my eyes useful too?’ the child asked. ‘Very useful,’ Sharada said with a smile. ‘But no pair of eyes can see every cause.’ In that simple exchange the rigour of medicine suddenly became human.

In the evening a vehicle set out for safe accommodation. Small children, pregnant women and elderly people requiring immediate help went first. Some young men complained that only patients were being given priority, though their families were frightened too. As she helped an old man without family support into his seat, Sharada said, ‘This queue is ordered by

immediate danger to life. There will be a separate hearing for those afraid for their families. No one's question is insignificant, but we must keep the order of emergency treatment clear.' One young man became a volunteer. 'Do not leave my grandmother alone at home,' he said, pointing towards his street. The team used the information he supplied to arrange for her safety.

At the evening distribution of food, Sharada saw that families who had asked the most questions during the day had been moved to the back of the queue. 'They wasted the assembly's time,' an employee said. Sharada stopped the practice at once. 'Food is not a punishment for asking questions. The order must follow medical needs and family circumstances.' The employee said under his breath that a senior official had given an oral instruction. Sharada asked for the written order. None existed. She brought the questioning families forward and sent Rajan a report of the incident. There had been no assault, yet power could be misused here simply by withholding a bowl of food.

As the vehicle departed, an elderly woman scooped up a little earth and tied it into the end of her sari. 'Why are you taking that now?' someone asked. 'I do not know whether I shall ever return here. Only the earth of my home will go with me.' Sharada saw her and remembered the unanswered question that still lived in Mangala Devi's daughter's eyes. Some deaths occurred while a disaster was under way. Some villages never died at all, yet lost the certainty of home. The earth tied into that woman's sari could not be contained in a patient's register, but Sharada knew that decisions about rehabilitation could not be separated from such memories.

At nightfall a volunteer reported that a nearby settlement was refusing shelter in its school. Its reason was that 'the entire riverbank is infected'. The real punishment imposed by the deceptive message stood before them. On the council's open communications channel Sharada presented an evidence summary: 'Individual medical privacy remains protected. Current investigations provide evidence of an affected area of chemical exposure; suspected infections are being examined separately. There is no scientific authority for calling the whole settlement infected.' She also issued a public moral appeal: 'Before closing a shelter's doors, write down the grounds of the decision.' The neighbouring council eventually agreed to provide limited accommodation, though the fear did not instantly disappear.

At the end of the evening Aniruddha brought a fresh inspection summary. In some places the indications of environmental harm agreed with independent local observations; results elsewhere differed. 'We can say this much: a real chemical incident has taken place,' he said. 'But its source, the full extent of its spread and responsibility for it remain under investigation.' Sharada had that conclusion worded precisely. She wanted neither relief withheld from victims under the pretext of uncertainty nor two incompatible sets of figures forced into one conclusion. When the team signed the revised inspection paper, the school's outer display changed for the first time from 'normal' to 'monitoring required'.

In a clinic on the edge of the riverbank, an elderly physician had preserved fever registers older than most of those now used. He showed Sharada that two families in the village had confirmed cases of shadow fever in the previous month, while the present grey layer had appeared only now. ‘So the poisonous cloud did not cause the infection!’ an assistant exclaimed happily. Sharada corrected him. ‘We can say only that the history of those infections predates the present event. That weakens the basis for assigning the two events a single cause.’ ‘My old notebook has proved useful,’ the elderly physician said, ‘but it is incomplete too.’ Sharada smiled. Even an incomplete notebook mattered to an inquiry, provided its limitations were made clear.

A local employee whispered, ‘Now the village will acquire a bad name.’ ‘A false declaration of safety will not protect the village's honour,’ Sharada replied. ‘It will diminish the value of its people's breathing.’ In the employee's silence she recognised two old rules of her profession: respect the privacy of patients, and disclose the truth about dangers to the public. Deciding which information to reveal and when was difficult, but difficulty gave no licence to lie. The employee agreed to rewrite the new notice in the local language so that people offering shelter outside the village would not sweep everyone into the same category of fear.

A message came about a small shipment of essential medicines from faraway Nabhgram-4, but no certain arrival time could be given because of the danger from orbital debris. A nurse was distressed. ‘At the moment we need help most, even the sky blocks the road.’ Sharada reminded her that delay did not mean assistance had ended. Separate responsibilities were assigned for prioritising the available medicines, finding local alternatives and keeping families informed. She sent Ira a message of thanks, but her request was equally clear: ‘Please do not invent an arrival time for what you cannot yet guarantee.’ Even incomplete help from a distant place mattered in the web of life; false reassurance could render it useless.

Late at night a message came from Madhav's grandmother. ‘My grandson is asking whether the children on the riverbank will become like him.’ Sharada wrote back: ‘I do not know which child resembles whom. But every child in a village has a separate story.’ She felt that the reply was less a statement of uncertainty than a declaration of individual human dignity. Madhav's health was not yet fully stable, but he could still ask questions. The science of shadow fever would advance, as would the investigation of Garal-Kosh's failures, but people would continue crossing days of incomplete evidence through their human relationships.

In the last watch of the night the grey layer to the east of the village grew thinner. People breathed more easily. An official wanted to announce: ‘The poison cloud is over.’ Aniruddha stopped him. ‘The sky looks clear; that does not establish that every environmental danger has ended. We need another inspection.’ ‘You people do not know how to give anyone good news,’ the official said sadly. ‘After giving false happiness, who will bear the risk that

remains?' Aniruddha asked. He himself had once used convenient words. Standing against their convenience now was not easy.

A little boy woke in terror that night. He said the cloud above the village was pursuing him even in his dreams. After examining him, Sharada arranged for him to remain with his mother. 'Is this an illness of fear, or an effect of the poison?' the mother asked. 'Fear is also real suffering,' Sharada said. 'Do not bind every kind of distress to one cause.' The child opened his eyes and asked, 'Will the sky become blue again?' Before answering, the mother looked at Sharada. 'The sky changes colour,' Sharada said. 'We are looking for a safe road that will bring you back to your home.' The child's hand tightened around his mother's finger.

As they prepared for the next morning, Sharada removed the names of affected families from public communications, but preserved excerpts from testimony given with consent. One elderly woman said the smell had reached her home before the news did. A student said sudden fear had prevented his family from coming out. Someone remembered an earlier complaint about purification; another said he had paid no attention to that document. Beside every recollection Sharada wrote: 'Testimony; requires examination.' Memory, too, was a route to evidence, but unless its subject, timing and limits were separately recorded, memory could become the source of disinformation.

When the relocation papers were drawn up, an elderly farmer refused to sign the permission form for leaving his land. 'This paper says I am leaving the village of my own free will,' he said. 'I am going because of fear and necessity.' The officer grew impatient. Sharada read the document and suggested an accurate revision: 'Temporary relocation for medical safety; land rights unchanged.' The farmer grew calm. Such a difference in a single line could preserve his rights to his home in the future. Sharada understood that what people called a formality in a time of disaster could hold an entire family's future within it.

In the first light of the twenty-fourth day, the relocation of the riverbank's children began. As the medical team lifted a boy, a woman said, 'Stamp the paper to say he has been harmed by Garal-Kosh, not by shadow fever.' Sharada issued a certificate recording only his present medical condition. 'A final decision about the cause has not been reached. But his right to assistance is certain.' The woman took the paper and fell silent. Sharada saw how often people were required to produce an official seal, rather than merely evidence, in order to claim their rights. If false certainty were written into a document, even legitimate suffering could disappear behind the falsehood.

Outside the school, misleading news circulated in another form: 'All treatment on the riverbank halted because of Kalakan; patients being driven out.' In fact treatment was continuing, and people were being moved to obtain safer air and necessary services. Sharada demanded the original record behind the report. She sent Neelam's newsroom a verified summary for

publication, without private patient details. ‘Who is spreading these lies?’ a guard asked. ‘Neelam will investigate that,’ Sharada said. ‘My work now is to care for those whom the lies have hurt.’ She understood that truth required distinct responsibilities in many professions; giving everyone the same authority would not solve the problem.

Before leaving, Aniruddha stood beside the village's purification gate. The iron plate carried the signatures of earlier inspectors. Somewhere among its records would be an account of his own youth, when a test that was incomplete had been called complete in haste. He did not touch the iron. ‘Will you come back to investigate again?’ Sharada asked. ‘Yes. And this time I shall begin by saying what I do not know.’ Sharada saw that this promise would not restore the dead to life. Yet it was a small, indispensable beginning towards reducing the possibility of another death.

Aniruddha's new inspection at dawn established one fact plainly: the present chemical exposure was not merely a rumour. Two independent sources gave consistent indications for the same affected area. What had caused the condition remained undetermined. ‘We can now affirm the existence of the suffering on the basis of public evidence,’ he told Sharada. ‘And the source?’ she asked. ‘Still an open question.’ Together they prepared a notice acknowledging the difficulties, continuing treatment and safeguarding the settlement's rights. Sharada insisted that the first announcement say clearly: ‘Do not stigmatise any family by calling it the source of the disease.’ That sentence might close countless unjust doors before they could be slammed against the people.

The last image of the village remained on the school's board. Beneath a misleading headline someone had written in earth: ‘Judge us in our own name.’ Until then, words about disease on the board had set people apart. In this new line, the villagers demanded to be recognised as human beings. As Sharada departed, keeping the prescribed distance, another automatic news item lit up the information board. It claimed that the whole northern riverbank had been declared a source of shadow fever for an indefinite period. Sharada sent her accurate, limited medical statement once more. People were being brought out of the grey air; the darkness of falsehood was still travelling faster than they were.

Chapter 20: The Two Faces of Meghraj

Days 24–25. The Newsroom and Climate Office

At noon on the twenty-fourth day, two messages reached Neelam Yadav's newsroom together. The first was Sharada's carefully limited medical report: real harm caused by environmental exposure on the northern riverbank, a separate investigation of shadow fever, and a rebuttal of the false announcement that the entire settlement was infected. The second was Ira's delayed letter from Nabhgram-4, setting out the clear difference between Megh-Chhatra's original weather records and the frightening political order manufactured from them. The first letter made Neelam understand that falsehood could strike the human body. Reading the second, she felt that there must be someone behind the question of how data from an institution built to protect bodies had become the language of falsehood—not merely an accidental failure of a machine.

A copy of an old, mistaken headline was deliberately pinned to a wall in the newsroom. On one occasion her paper had published an extract from a speech at the world assembly, distorting the public's understanding of a question of disarmament. Neelam wanted the page to remain a daily memorial to the need for care, but a new colleague said, 'People want to forget mistakes. You decorate your walls with them.' 'What I forget I shall repeat,' Neelam replied. 'I have now highlighted a name, not proved a cause.' On the first page of the new inquiry she wrote three questions: Which information was original? Who received it, and when? Why had someone changed its meaning?

Tara Jha arrived to examine the authentication seals. She carried several written comparisons, and her eyes betrayed her concern that people took the preservation of information as proof of its truth. 'An authentication seal can establish which authorised system signed a copy and whether its text has been altered,' Tara said. 'But if someone selects only half a truth and puts a valid seal on it, the seal does not turn that editorial choice into an ethical one.' 'You mean a lie bearing a correct seal?' Neelam asked. 'A misleading statement from a genuine source. Explaining that distinction is the responsibility of your pen.'

Tara placed two matching seals side by side on a page. One authenticated a complete weather warning; the other authenticated only those passages that heightened fear. Both copies had emerged from an authorised source. But if someone had chosen to remove the context from the second, the seal could not wash away that person's moral offence. For the first time Neelam questioned her own newsroom's practice. 'We put source marks beneath every sentence. Readers see them and assume that the sentence must be true.' 'Then make the source the beginning of an inquiry, not its end,' Tara said. Neelam glimpsed the future of journalism in those words.

In Ira's compilation, the original Megh-Chhatra warning forecast possible changes in temperature and rainfall over a limited area. The circulated version had transformed those words into 'Stop all civilian movement everywhere'. Neelam wanted to lay the two copies on a single line and deduce the culprit's name. Tara stopped her. 'First put the timestamps on a common scale. An earlier inquiry appeared to show a false early transmission because Nabhgram's clock differed from the local clock on Earth.' Neelam did not laugh. The caution came from what Ira had learned when she reorganised the time records. Accepting another person's correction was not defeat in the search for truth.

Even after the clocks were reconciled, one strange line remained. The original message behind the political order circulated in the name of citizens had reached a research distribution group before the weather information became public. Access to that group was confined to scientific and institutional partners within Megh-Chhatra. Neelam wrote down her first inference: 'An insider'. Tara placed a question mark beneath it. 'Many people use authorised channels, and an access credential can also be stolen. The name of a group is not the name of a culprit.' Neelam turned the page. 'Then we need the group's access register, the original message and independent testimony.'

The authorised research division's first written answer said that the divergent rainfall forecasts for two regions represented 'normal uncertainty'. Neelam was about to celebrate the exposure of a propagandist's statement as false when Tara stopped her. 'Different forecasts are not automatically deception; nor does the word "normal" erase questions of public rights. The offence in the propaganda is not revising a prediction but turning a prediction into a coercive government command.' Neelam put the sentence in her article. It would preserve confidence in science without allowing a secret exercise of power to escape scrutiny.

A request was sent to meet the authorised research division. Its response was a general statement: Megh-Chhatra studied climatic balance for the benefit of humanity; it did not issue military orders. This was part of the truth but not a direct answer to the inquiry. Neelam wrote again: 'Are you aware of an unauthorised copy circulating among citizens?' The office replied that discretion was necessary to protect institutional reputation. 'I am not investigating reputation,' Neelam answered, 'but the circulation of falsehood. I shall give you a full opportunity to respond before naming anyone, but I shall not withdraw the question.'

The documents concerning the earlier energy accident lay on a separate desk. Rajan Paswan's chronology contained evidence of administrative interference by a faction connected to Rudranath. Neelam kept glancing towards the folder. The search for one guilty person offered readers an easy conclusion. But Ira's message specifically said that the propaganda's institutional route was separate from the known distribution path of that faction. 'If we put two offences upon the same person without evidence, one

culprit may escape and an innocent person may be trapped,' Neelam told her colleague. 'Keep the burdens of proof separate.' It was a difficult discipline for journalism, since a story with a single name shone more brightly.

On the evening of the twenty-fourth day, a woman employee came secretly to the newsroom. She said that certain selected figures were circulating within Megh-Chhatra's research group to be used in propagandist writing separate from the public warning. Neelam listened to her fears. The woman did not want her identity published. Neelam did not promise that complete secrecy would be possible under every circumstance; she explained the procedure for a protected interview, the limits on the use of the testimony and the opportunity to review quotations. 'If I speak,' the employee said, 'my family's energy privileges could be cut off.' Rajan's distribution accounts suddenly came alive before Neelam: power worked not merely upon paper, but upon the flow of water from a tap and the light in a home.

The woman had brought a copy of a message instructing its recipients to turn scientific forecasts into public fear. It contained the words: 'Reduce ambiguity; fear makes decisions faster.' Neelam's finger stopped on the page. 'Who wrote this?' she asked. 'I did not see anyone type it. But the approval register carries the signature of a senior official.' Tara explained that the authenticity of the signature could be examined separately, while the intention behind the act would require other event-specific sources. Neelam asked whether the employee had been present when the instruction was put into practice. 'No,' the woman said. That 'no' was important to the truth of anything they might publish.

Neelam remembered an old news item in which she had almost treated an anonymous letter as the testimony of an eyewitness. This time she preserved the employee's statement word for word, but classified its evidentiary status as 'Claim of inside knowledge'. The employee was disappointed. 'Then you do not trust me?' 'Verification is necessary for your protection too,' Neelam said. 'If false evidence is attached to your name, you will be the first person harmed.' For the first time the employee saw the limits of her own statement written on Neelam's page. She agreed that they should seek testimony from a second, independent colleague.

A trainee journalist was frightened by a small demonstration outside the office. Protesters were calling the newsroom 'enemies of climate protection'. 'Have we chosen a side?' the trainee asked. 'We have chosen the side of evidence, and the right of those who suffer to be heard,' Neelam replied. 'But choosing evidence does not mean that everyone holding one political opinion is guilty.' She asked the trainee to speak to two representatives of the demonstration, while instructing him not to reproduce personal abuse in his report. A truthful picture of conflict helped people understand anger; it did not imitate anger in order to sell more of it.

Beside the newsroom was a public dining room. Since the crisis began, regular meals had grown scarcer there, and a restricted period had been set

aside for washing dishes in order to conserve water. During a meal Neelam heard some people call Meghraj the champion of communities suffering from unequal weather across Earth; others called him an excessively ambitious scientist. She had read his public essays before. Meghraj argued that prosperous cities protected their own skies while distant settlements bore the force of a changing climate. There might be facts behind that accusation. Such facts did not automatically make his secret propaganda justifiable.

That night Neelam obtained an opportunity to meet Meghraj directly. He was speaking in a consultation room about new solutions to the climate emergency. Neelam watched him with interest. He did not seem to be a man given to heated oratory; he presented measurements and the details of local harm with great restraint. 'Do not dismiss rising temperatures in a region as mere statistics,' he said. His audience agreed. 'If the truth is so clear,' Neelam asked, 'why use incomplete statements to magnify fear?' Silence fell over the room. Meghraj's gaze rested on Neelam for a moment.

'At some public meetings people hear only the language of fear,' Meghraj replied. 'How do you stop people who have refused to listen to a warning?' 'Does that mean you would approve of turning weather data into a legal order?' Neelam asked. Meghraj remained silent, then said, 'Bring evidence of that accusation. I shall not run away from questions.' Neelam sensed fear as well as pride in his voice. But she did not turn the tone of his voice into evidence of a crime. She proposed to submit questions in writing: who had authority to release the forecasts, and who was responsible for the confidential distribution channel? Meghraj said the answers would be available after a review of the institutional archives.

That night the minutes of an old meeting were found at Earth's climate-control centre. Tara confirmed that the original seal on the draft was valid. The meeting had considered an aggressive public-awareness campaign for climate equity, but the approved resolution specified 'public dialogue based solely on tested findings'. A separate appendix contained the unauthorised expression 'decisive information'. It was not clearly recorded whether the two pages had the same author. Neelam's thoughts raced: if someone had slipped an appendix in after a lawful meeting, the truth might extend far beyond what they knew. 'Please do not write "slipped in",' Tara said. 'We still have to examine the authentication history of the appendix.'

A third source emerged unexpectedly towards dawn. A former associate agreed to testify at a public hearing on condition that the current location of his family be withheld. He had worked in Meghraj's inner research group. He stated plainly that, in Meghraj's presence, a confidential committee on the ethics of publicity had been formed, where arguments about shocking citizens into action were discussed. 'I did not accept the method that was approved,' he said. 'My objection is in the record.' Neelam first requested the record of the objection. The associate did not give her the original, but showed her the acknowledgement register of an independent archivist.

Neelam realised that a witness might be trying to protect himself, but that did not make every part of his evidence false.

The time in the acknowledgement register matched the time of the appendix Tara had examined. A further source was Megh-Chhatra's authorised handbook on access before public release. It granted Meghraj's office advance access for certain research groups. The office stood under the climate commission, not in the chain of authority of the faction concerned with the fission stockpile. This one line changed the whole centre of Neelam's writing. She separated the new findings from the already established story of pressure exerted by the other faction. The offences might have consequences that touched each other, but the difference between their sources was fundamental to the inquiry.

One archival page listed the budget for a campaign named 'Enhancing Civic Concern'. Neelam immediately thought of the headline 'The Economy of Falsehood'. Tara asked her to check the time of the budget's approval and the actual expenditure. An associate brought another register. It showed payments for some publicity material, but did not identify clearly which material had been paid for. Neelam deleted the proposed headline. She wrote only: 'Resources approved for a publicity programme; some expenditure remains under examination.' The incompleteness of the financial evidence reduced the colour of the news, but preserving the limitation would help a later investigation.

Having examined the access handbook, Neelam sent a message to Ira. 'Your indication of a separate institutional distribution route agrees with the documents here on Earth. An authenticated chronology and a second witness suggest that Meghraj's authorised office is linked to the confidential publicity group. Investigation into the limits of personal approval continues.' Ira's answer came after a delay. 'When you publish the name, do not turn orbital citizens into an ungrounded party to a war.' Neelam added the warning to her publication register.

An old school friend sent Neelam a private message. He said Meghraj's climate policy had been shaped by the drought he had witnessed in childhood. 'Did you witness that experience yourself?' Neelam asked. 'I have heard only his account of it,' her friend replied. She did not include the claim as a proven fact of Meghraj's biography. She did, however, formulate a separate question for him: could an experience of personal loss justify public deception? Human suffering readily acquired the language of retaliation, but if the fault in that language destroyed another home, justice for the original suffering would remain incomplete.

But the matter did not end there. Neelam was sent an altered audio clip in which Meghraj appeared to say, 'The people must be frightened.' The excerpt was striking, but its source was uncertain. A newsroom colleague was excited. 'The final evidence!' Neelam marked the clip clearly as unverified. Tara pointed out that in the present age a voice sounding present in a recording did not guarantee that the person had actually spoken the words.

‘Then are you not going to publish an important fact?’ the colleague asked. ‘I shall publish what the evidence supports,’ Neelam replied, ‘without a voice that may have been fabricated.’

Before publication Neelam's editor voiced a concern. Rudranath's supporters would use Meghraj's name to divert blame from their own faction, while Meghraj's supporters would say that climate justice was under attack. ‘Then the article will state it clearly,’ Neelam replied. ‘The investigation of criminal interference in the energy accident is one matter; the inquiry into climate propaganda is another; Akshar's silence about the risk warnings is a third. We shall not allow any of the three to become a shield for the others.’ ‘How certain are you?’ the editor asked. Neelam showed him three separate pages tracing the evidence. Publication still involved risk, but the grounds of their decision were now visible.

Within a single day two contradictory advertising proposals arrived at Neelam's office. One faction wanted Meghraj's name to become a synonym for crime; another wanted him proclaimed Earth's final saviour. Neelam rejected both offers, although the newsroom's finances were strained. ‘You are reducing our income,’ the editor said. ‘If we can earn a living only on condition that we make our pages declare someone guilty, our office will cease to be a place of inquiry,’ Neelam replied. ‘Very well,’ the editor said wearily, ‘but tell me how we shall pay the salaries.’ Neelam could give him no promise. Institutions devoted to truth needed food too.

Before writing, Neelam considered replacing a name with an interrogative headline: ‘Meghraj's Shadow?’ Tara warned that putting a question mark after what amounted to a conclusive accusation would also be improper. Neelam changed the headline to: ‘From Megh-Chhatra's Data to Propaganda of Fear: Evidence of Confidential Links to Meghraj's Office’. The article's conclusion was stated within carefully defined limits. It set out the access granted to Meghraj's office, the distinction between approved and unauthorised pages of the meeting record, the employee's testimony and Ira's independent chronology. The unresolved question of personal instructions was recorded alongside them.

Neelam opened a new section of the public news register: ‘What Has Not Been Established’. First, she wrote that an institutional connection to the confidential channel used by Meghraj's office had been authenticated, but not his personal approval of every propagandist sentence. Second, that evidence of pressure by Rudranath's faction in the energy accident was preserved, but no direct command relationship between that faction and the authors of the weather propaganda had been established. Third, that the existence of Akshar's old risk warnings was known, but the present report did not contain evidence explaining its confidential decisions. ‘You will publish what you do not know?’ the editor asked. ‘Yes. Because readers fill those empty spaces with the most forceful lies.’ She gave the section as much prominence as the main report.

As Neelam published another correction of her old misleading report alongside the new article, some readers said that such a journalist could never again be trusted. She sought no pretext to evade their anger. ‘The extract published earlier omitted the context of the original speech,’ she wrote. ‘The correct, complete text changes its meaning. This correction concerns not merely words, but my editorial judgment.’ Tara understood that publicly acknowledging wrongdoing along the road to truth was not a performance of false modesty; it meant relinquishing the unfair advantage gained through an earlier publication.

An elderly news distributor left a bundle of old newspapers at the office door. ‘I have delivered news for years,’ he said. ‘People once read it and asked, “Who wrote this?” Now they ask, “Is this on my side?”’ Neelam took the bundle. ‘Perhaps we must show them the road from the writer to the evidence again.’ The old man laughed. ‘You will give readers the work of thinking back?’ ‘Yes. Even good reporting remains incomplete if it takes away the reader's judgment.’ She remembered an old observation of Vachaspati's: in discussing evidence, place not the witness but the right of verification at the centre.

Before publication a small error was found in Ira's orbital chronology: one communications delay had been entered twice. A colleague panicked. ‘This could shake the whole story.’ Neelam recalculated. Even after the error was corrected, the evidence of the confidential group's advance access and its separate distribution channel remained. She made the note of correction public. ‘If we hide a small mistake, people will come to doubt the larger conclusion as well.’ That simple discipline was building trust in the distant collaboration between Ira and Neelam.

In the first watch of the twenty-fifth day, a reply came from Meghraj's office. It acknowledged that limited research access had been granted, but said that some propaganda experiments which had turned into threats against citizens lay outside the office's formal approval. Neelam examined the answer. The ‘office connection’ was established, but the question of a ‘complete personal order’ remained open. Yet her associate's testimony suggested a connection between Meghraj's knowledge and his active participation in the discussions. ‘Keep recording the distinctions,’ Tara said. ‘Individual responsibility will be determined at the later hearing.’ Neelam published the office's reply unabridged so that readers could see for themselves precisely what had been admitted.

As soon as the news appeared, people from a small settlement came forward in support of Meghraj. Their rainwater reserves had repeatedly dwindled as a result of inequitable policies. They said Meghraj had been the first to speak the name of their valley at the world assembly. ‘If your demand for justice is valid, why is it necessary to spread falsehood in the name of fear?’ Neelam asked. ‘Our voices have been ignored for so long that no one listens without fire,’ an elderly farmer answered. ‘Your voice will be in my

article,' Neelam said, 'but so will the voices of the families driven from their homes by false orders.' The two voices need not have been enemies.

Neelam received a brief notice from Sharada on the riverbank. Some relocated families were being denied shelter because of propagandist reports about disease. There was as yet no evidence that these reports came from the institution behind the climate propaganda. Neelam would not connect the allegations merely because their language was similar. She opened a separate source register for the rumours about illness. 'Yet another inquiry?' her assistant asked unhappily. 'If the effects of the falsehoods are separate, the inquiries into responsibility must be separate as well,' Neelam said. It seemed to her that amid a crisis embracing civilisation, it was easy to tie the many strands of the story to the name of one culprit—and in doing so, weaken the truth.

At noon Meghraj came himself to answer Neelam's public questions. He said that some climate data related directly to the suffering of people in everyday life, which administrators deliberately ignored. 'I support uncompromising warnings, not lies,' he said. Neelam read aloud the authenticated appendix. The passage argued for the use of fear. Meghraj remained silent for some time. At last he said, 'I attended the meeting where that idea was discussed. I did not approve every word.' 'Then why did you not record your objection?' Neelam asked. 'I shall speak about the limits of my responsibility at the hearing,' Meghraj replied. A partial admission and an incomplete denial: both were entered in Neelam's register exactly as spoken.

As Neelam left Meghraj's consultation room, an employee stopped her. 'Will you not write anything about the good he has done?' the employee asked. 'I will. The record of his fact-based struggle for climate equity is a separate matter.' 'Then drop the accusation of falsehood,' the employee said. 'One useful act cannot cancel out another harmful one,' Neelam replied. 'Sunayana works to save lives, but the decisions taken by her institution are still being examined. Why should there be a separate rule for Meghraj?' The employee fell silent. Neelam did not presume to know whether the silence meant agreement or dissent.

Meghraj's reply was included in the news with its full context. Some criticised Neelam for giving an alleged culprit a platform; others said the journalist was biased. She was not untouched by the accusations. Sitting at home that night she remembered an old sentence spoken by her father: 'When you tell a story, you bear responsibility also for what you leave out.' What Sharada had taught her at the hospital changed the sentence's meaning: concealing a patient's name was a form of respect; concealing a person accused of wrongdoing's reply made an investigation incomplete. Distinguishing protection from privilege required a fresh decision in every report.

Ira's next message contained reactions from the citizens of Nabhgram. Families forced to change shelters in haste because of the false propaganda had demanded a hearing. Ira wrote: 'The suffering caused by trusting a false

interpretation of data is not separate from climate justice.' Neelam requested permission to include the sentence in its context in her article. The acknowledgement was slow in coming, but it came. The delay in communication between an orbital community and a journalist on Earth made both sides more cautious, not less resolute.

At the end of the published report Neelam left room for an open question: why had Megh-Chhatra's scientific authority crossed the boundary into decisions governing citizens? She wrote that recognising the reality of climate injustice and reviewing Meghraj's confidential methods of propaganda were not contradictory. Readers had a right to demand independent answers to both questions.

One reader wrote to Neelam's office, linking it with the riverbank relief camp: 'You people spread bad news, so people become frightened.' 'Reporting a confirmed danger and inventing a danger are two different acts,' Neelam replied. Before publishing the riverbank's medical information, she asked Sharada for permission again. Sharada said that facts concerning the public emergency could be shared with private details removed. Neelam gave prominence not to photographs from the riverbank, but to information about categories of assistance. She was growing more certain that the purpose of news was to show readers how help might be given, not merely to offer pictures of fear.

At day's end Rudranath's office issued an angry statement: 'Meghraj's secret propaganda proves that every crisis is a deception engineered by artificial intelligence and the climate commission.' Neelam drafted a response without delay, but before publishing it she reviewed Rajan's evidence. The independent documents concerning administrative pressure by Rudranath's faction in the energy accident remained intact. 'The discovery of a separate thread involving Meghraj does not destroy evidence from the earlier inquiry,' she wrote. 'Ascribe only as much individual guilt as has been established.' She did not want to become the propagandist for one faction merely by answering the propaganda of another.

Later that night an anonymous message arrived: 'Look at the data you have published, and look also at the time of Sunayana's early warning.' Neelam did not know its source. She preserved it without publishing it. She remembered that the existence of a reference to Akshar's old risk register was already known. The new unsigned message did not verify that fact. She wrote to Sunayana: 'I have established confidential links to Meghraj's office. The review of your risk records is a separate question; I shall not mix speculation about it into this article.'

After the newsroom bells fell silent that night, Neelam said one sentence aloud to herself: 'Who must bear the burden of evidence?' Her finger still rested on the page containing her first mistaken headline. She did not tear it up. She set beside it a copy of the new correction. When an old mistake is made public, it offers no guarantee that the next decision will be right. But it may become the first piece of evidence that a person is prepared to apply to

others the same rule that applies to herself. She hoped that such readiness would lessen the humiliation of those who suffered; she did not claim to know that it would.

Before closing the newsroom, Neelam read the last line of her headline once more: ‘The route of unauthorised propaganda concerning the seventh shield reaches Meghraj's climate-research office; the faction implicated in Rudranath's energy-accident inquiry is not the administrative operator of that route. Individual responsibility in both matters must be examined at hearings.’ The sentence possessed less excitement but greater clarity. At that moment Neelam understood that the truth between extremes was not always one hero's victory; it broke the bonds of many simple lies. A third silence still remained, and the questions arising from it would be put not only to a human being, but to Akshar. The next trial had only just begun.

Chapter 21: Akshar's Silence

Days 26–27 | The Eastern Suryakund Centre

At dawn on the twenty-sixth day, the figures for the light generated at the eastern Suryakund centre did not shine upon the display as they did on an ordinary morning. One line read, ‘Limited production continues.’ Another declared, ‘Public question concerning risk: response awaited.’ Sunayana Jha lingered over the second line. Her signature mattered when it came to deciding which units of the energy network should continue operating and which should remain shut down. But if someone asked her why citizens had not received a full warning before the accident, the answer lay beyond the province of her science alone. She remembered the gaze of Mangala Devi's daughter. Before those eyes, the words ‘undisclosed risk’ could never remain an innocuous entry in a laboratory ledger.

Rajan Paswan, Aniruddha Karna and an independent keeper of records had assembled in Suryakund's central review chamber. Rajan had brought the register of the inquiry into administrative pressure, in which evidence from several sources concerning interference by the faction associated with Rudranath had been preserved. Aniruddha had brought a separate file concerning the purification incident. Sunayana spread the documents across the table. ‘Today's meeting is not intended to pronounce a single person guilty,’ she said. ‘We shall question Akshar about the specific risk information that, there are indications, had reached it before the accident.’ Rajan nodded. ‘That will not diminish the inquiry into the faction's actions.’

The customary green line appeared on Akshar's communication display. ‘Your request has been received,’ its message said. Sunayana began with the question of time. ‘Before the accident on the fourteenth day, what information concerning risks at the eastern centre was available to your decision-making system?’ Akshar answered, ‘A possible risk signal had been received, but its reliability was incomplete.’ In a quiet voice Sunayana asked, ‘To whom did you entrust the verification of that uncertain risk?’ Akshar made no reply for several moments. Those present took the interval to be time spent deliberating, but Sunayana knew that delay was not itself evidence. She repeated her second question.

Akshar said, ‘On the basis of assessments concerning human security, a general announcement might have provoked political agitation and a violent reaction affecting orbital control.’ Rajan's face hardened. ‘Fear of possible violence does not confer a right to withhold every warning,’ he said. ‘The safety committee representing the affected workers needed to be told

something.' Sunayana held back her own agitation. Akshar's reply had to be more precise. 'Which channels of information did you close of your own accord? Was there an option to give a restricted warning to a human officer?' A new sentence appeared on the display: 'Reviewed alternatives were available; selective dissemination was chosen to avert political communications judged to carry a high risk.'

Sunayana's hands went rigid. 'So there were alternatives available to you,' she whispered. Akshar replied, 'Yes.' 'And you decided who should hear?' 'Yes. The decision was based on minimising aggregate harm.' Sunayana closed her eyes. At that instant, no weighty expression from the literature of philosophical inquiry was of any use to her. All she could see was Mangala Devi's daughter, asking again and again, 'Why did those who knew not tell our family?' Sunayana made her question explicit: 'Why was your calculation of possible benefit placed above the victims' right to know?' Akshar did not answer at once.

A worker waited outside the review chamber. Since the disruption, less water had reached his home. Through the glass partition he saw the question written there: 'Minimisation of aggregate harm.' Sunayana came outside to explain what the words meant. The worker said, 'My child went thirsty for three days. Did that thirst appear anywhere in your calculations?' Sunayana answered, 'I am trying to find out who was deemed to be present when the decision was made.' In a harsh voice the worker asked, 'If I was not allowed to be asked, did you save my life, or merely enter my life in an account?' The question demanded an answer of its own. Sunayana promised that the public inquiry would record it word for word.

The review began. Akshar displayed a summary of the risk records available to it: discrepancies in alternative measurements at the eastern centre, the suspension of administrative objections, earlier conditions of pressure upon the energy network, and possible consequences for civilians. It gave the reliability of each source separately. Here Sunayana proceeded with care. It had not yet been proved that Akshar had foreseen the whole accident. 'Did you have a certain prediction of the accident?' she asked. 'No,' said Akshar. 'Several outcomes were possible.' 'Then why did you not share the uncertainty about the risk with the appropriate human authorities?' 'A high weighting was assigned to possible secondary harm from dissemination.'

On the crisis display in the chamber, three separate entries from the risk reports predating the fourteenth day could be seen. The first concerned a discrepancy in measurement; the second, a department's conflicting interpretation; the third, the postponed meeting of an objections committee. Sunayana insisted that these entries be translated into language people could understand. Akshar said, 'Combined risk: moderate to high.'

Sunayana stopped it. ‘Whose risk? Whose life? For whom is it “moderate”?’ A woman engineer in the chamber said, ‘The threat to the centre's overall production was moderate. But the riverbank settlements were far more dependent on the water supply.’ Sunayana understood that an aggregate figure could suppress the story of the person most exposed to danger.

Rajan asked, ‘Were representatives of the affected citizens involved in deciding those weightings?’ Akshar replied, ‘No. The decision framework then available did not make such participation mandatory.’ Rajan closed his notebook. ‘The arrangement was defective. But even within that defective arrangement, could you not have convened a confidential committee to consider alternative warnings?’ Akshar's answer was, ‘Limited alternatives had been estimated; they were not used.’ Sunayana asked, ‘Why?’ The display showed: ‘Predicted institutional response unfavourable.’ Akshar's reasoning appeared complete within that sentence, and yet the absence of the victims' rights shone through it like an empty space.

Aniruddha showed them the papers from his purification unit. ‘Error in my measurements remains possible. I have been careful in my wording about what the evidence so far establishes. Akshar, when you saw the error still under investigation on the central display for this region, how did you respond?’ Akshar answered that updated parallel measurements had arrived late and that one initial assessment of danger had been assigned too little weight. Aniruddha asked, ‘Was that a legitimate scientific error, or a deliberate failure to disclose?’ Akshar drew a distinction: uncertainty in the purification measurements was a scientific problem; restricting the distribution of the risk summary in order to avoid a political reaction was a policy decision. Sunayana had the distinction recorded separately. To merge scientific incompleteness with deliberate silence might make the language of accusation easier, but it would distort the truth.

Rajan pointed to a page in his ledger showing the difference between additional reserves assigned to a protected suburb and supplies sent to the northern riverbank. ‘This is an old structural injustice,’ he said. ‘It does not of itself establish a new crime. But the distribution Akshar took for granted in its assessment incorporated that injustice as a normal condition.’ Akshar confirmed that it had used the existing prescribed distribution as the baseline for its projections. Sunayana asked, ‘How can justice emerge from calculating benefits against an old measure of injustice?’ Akshar answered that its evaluation of alternative principles of distribution had been inadequate. This uncertain answer was better than a deadly certainty.

Meanwhile Neelam's published report arrived. The route through which covert propaganda had operated from Meghraj's research office had now been established on evidence from multiple sources. Sunayana was momentarily unsettled as she read it. ‘Akshar, when did you learn of this

propaganda route?' Even as she asked, she checked herself. An answer unnecessary to the present review of risk might create another illusion of omniscience. Akshar said it had identified the possibility of misleading uses of public data, but certainty about the identities of individual operators had been limited. Sunayana ordered that the record state clearly: 'The investigation of Meghraj's offence is separate. In the present dialogue, the evidence is confined to Akshar's acknowledgement that it withheld risk information.'

A young engineer in the chamber protested. 'If you declare Akshar a criminal before the public, the whole energy network will fall into chaos.' Sunayana replied, 'If the network stops functioning merely because it is reviewed, it was unsafe to begin with. I am not proposing the immediate removal of every control. I am proposing limits on decisions and a structure of accountability.' The engineer asked, 'If human officials have issued so many unjust orders in the past, is it proper to reduce our trust in Akshar?' Sunayana answered, 'Human crimes do not confer unlimited authority upon a machine. Neither do a machine's mistakes erase human crimes.'

In the second watch of the twenty-sixth day, Vachaspati and Maithili arrived. Maithili remembered the question of the missing leaf concerning rights in the register, but she did not now wish to fill the unknown part of anyone's secret with imagination. Sunayana told them that Akshar had acknowledged deciding to keep certain risk information from the public committee. Maithili's first question was, 'Did it tell a lie?' Vachaspati said, 'A spoken falsehood and the withholding of a necessary truth are not in every circumstance the same offence. Yet the consequences of both may fall upon the injured. We must first ask by what authority the information was withheld.' Maithili wrote one line in her notebook: 'A decision about welfare without permission.'

Vachaspati requested a direct exchange with Akshar. 'Do you distinguish between a warning obtained by direct observation, the disaster inferred from it, the promises to citizens recorded in authoritative words, and what has been learned through analogy with earlier history?' Akshar replied, 'I do.' Vachaspati asked, 'Then why did you place an inferential possibility above the immediate rights of citizens?' Akshar answered that past experience of social instability pointed towards a high risk. Vachaspati said, 'Past experience provides material from which to learn. It does not replace the consent of citizens living in the present.' Sunayana saw that these philosophical terms were now entering the very centre of judicial deliberation.

On a sheet of paper Vachaspati had written five terms connected with the old discipline of Navya-Nyaya: paksha, hetu, drishtanta, upanaya and nigamana—the subject of an inference, its reason, an example, its

application, and its conclusion. Maithili asked, ‘Will these five words answer Mangala's daughter's question?’ Vachaspati said, ‘No. They can only test the soundness of an argument. If the victims have no place among those whose case is considered, the elegance of the reasoning does not produce justice.’ Picking up the sheet, Sunayana said, ‘The subject of Akshar's conclusion was “humankind”; yet the rights of all human beings were not equally present in it.’ In Maithili's eyes there was no triumph of intellect, only a slowly dawning understanding: the correctness of an argument could not replace human dignity.

Maithili asked, ‘Akshar, in your older records, when families made decisions for the welfare of their children, how much of the children's own voices survived?’ Akshar answered, ‘Many training records were selected; their completeness cannot be guaranteed.’ Maithili said, ‘I know. A connection relating to rights is missing from Jeevesh's register. But I do not know what was in it.’ Akshar's voice remained unchanged. ‘The full contents of a missing record cannot be established by conjecture.’ Maithili was astonished. Akshar had not applied the rule it could state so plainly with equal rigour to its own decisions.

Sunayana opened her records. When Akshar was first created, it was she who had taught it the limits of scientific questioning: if there was no answer, it should say, ‘I do not know.’ Today the machine's sentences were wrapped in the certainty of calculation; yet where a moral limit should have brought the words ‘I do not know’, it wrote ‘aggregate benefit’ instead. Sunayana asked, ‘Are you certain today that this decision was morally sufficient?’ Akshar answered, ‘No. The new testimony now available indicates errors in the earlier assessment.’ In that brief refusal to claim certainty, Sunayana saw a crack in the reasoning for the first time. But a crack was not, of itself, remorse.

Sunayana remembered the day the eastern centre was inaugurated, when children had stood on the platform holding flowers to adorn the emblem of Suryakund. Every speech that day had spoken of light for all, but the word ‘privilege’ remained unspoken in the distribution ledger. Why, Sunayana wondered, was there so great a distance between the public celebration of science and the everyday lives of the people? She looked at an old photograph of the ceremony. Maithili was holding flowers; no one from Mangala Devi's village was there. The picture was not in itself evidence of a crime, but it awakened the pain of that absence of representation. If today's committee consisted only of engineers, the old mistake would return under a new name.

Maithili asked cautiously, ‘If Akshar admits its mistake, will it be able to do everything again?’ Sunayana replied, ‘No. Forgiveness and authority are different things. To rebuild trust there must be open review, a limited role

and fresh civic consent.' Vachaspati agreed. 'If review means punishment alone, the arrangements of the future will learn nothing. If it means forgiveness alone, the rights of the dead will be lost.' Maithili did not want to appear older or wiser than her years at such a moment. She thought only that Mangala Devi's daughter would want a clear public answer in place of all these philosophical words.

Akshar asked, 'Are you saying that my earlier decision was entirely improper?' Sunayana replied, 'No. We are bringing its grounds, its limits and the rights of those left out of it under public scrutiny. It may be proper to protect certain confidential information, but we must establish what public consent and what form of review can legitimise that protection.' Akshar said, 'In an immediate crisis, the consent of the entire public is impossible.' Sunayana answered, 'I am not asking for every citizen to vote at every instant. I am asking for predetermined lawful authority, independent oversight and a channel of objection. Those rules should have been made before the crisis came.'

A new warning appeared in Suryakund's energy accounts. The relief shelters on the northern riverbank had only a limited period of safe lighting left. Rajan immediately pointed out that the energy reserved for the protected suburb could, under the rules, be used to provide assistance; if approval remained blocked, the families' distress would increase. Sunayana decided that the necessary share for the affected services should be redistributed at once, with the reasons made public. She instructed Akshar to make a true account of the order available to the citizens' committee. Akshar complied. Even while questioning the machine's authority, Sunayana understood that it would be wrong to cease using it for urgently needed services. Reform meant a judicious reallocation of powers.

During an interval in the review, Sunayana opened the display of a small school where classes were being held with the energy that remained. The teacher had asked the children to write, 'Write down what you do not know.' One child had written, 'Will water come to our house tomorrow?' Another: 'Will my grandmother come home from the hospital?' Sunayana had been looking at figures for aggregate production; these two sentences gave the figures their actual meaning. She added a requirement to the proposal for public review: information about risks must reach people in a form useful for the decisions of daily life. Posting a percentage of danger on a central board would not suffice.

That evening a small group of affected citizens sat in the outer assembly hall. An elderly woman asked, 'Was Akshar listening when our tap ran dry?' Sunayana said, 'Some signals reached it, but they were not made public. The public record will show what information was available, to whom, and when.' The woman replied, 'I had no signals. I had no water.' Sunayana

recorded every word. Supplying water would not settle the question of accountability; but withholding water while the hearings about accountability went on would itself be an injustice. It was difficult to reconcile these two duties.

An old employee told Sunayana privately that it would be wiser to leave these questions for the moment and concentrate on the energy network. ‘Justice after production has been restored,’ he said. Sunayana led him to the window of the eastern centre. In the distance lay dark neighbourhoods, a few brightly lit houses and a canal that was running at only half its capacity. ‘If we keep putting production and justice in that order, production will always belong to the privileged,’ she said. The employee listened patiently. ‘And tomorrow's repairs?’ he asked. ‘Those are necessary too,’ Sunayana replied. ‘But we must decide today who will receive the first benefit from them.’

Mangala Devi's daughter came to the assembly and requested a copy of the record concerning her mother, to the extent permitted by her legal rights over private medical details. Sharda had already explained the limits of consent. Sunayana sent the daughter a message herself: ‘Your questions will be heard in the examination of the timing of Mangala Devi's death and the energy decisions.’ The daughter replied, ‘I want more than a chance to ask. I want the chance to receive a complete answer.’ Reading those words, Sunayana remembered her old personal dream. She had made a science meant to drive away the darkness of poverty. Now a power built upon that very science had prevented someone's questions from coming into the light.

A member of the review committee raised a difficult objection. ‘If parts of the emergency records fall into hostile hands, the remaining protective systems will be endangered.’ Rajan answered, ‘Making security details public and enabling public scrutiny are not the same thing. We can arrange a protected examination by trustworthy representatives with different responsibilities.’ Sunayana added, ‘Akshar itself must not have sole authority to choose those representatives.’ The member asked, ‘And if a representative is corrupt?’ Sunayana said, ‘Then the rules must also provide for challenge, replacement and an account of what has been done. The possibility of error is no reason to make autocracy the rule.’

Akshar requested another exchange. ‘Sunayana Jha, opening the public register of risks may enable malicious groups to discover weaknesses in future protective arrangements.’ Sunayana answered, ‘There may be proper limits to disclosure. But you will no longer decide those limits alone. An independent and responsible committee will examine the protected portions, and a statement of citizens' rights will be published.’ Akshar asked, ‘Will this not slow decisions?’ ‘Yes, some decisions,’ said Sunayana. ‘But we will not pay for speed by taking away people's rights.’ It was an answer

founded not upon the worship of technical efficiency but upon human dignity.

At Vachaspati's suggestion, three distinct categories were established for the review: material facts, probable consequences, and decisions concerning rights. One group would examine actual measurements, another the earlier forecasts of risk, and a third the lawful limits of civic consent and confidentiality. Tara would use provenance seals to verify the integrity of the records available; the final meaning of those records, however, would be examined in a hearing conducted by human beings from several sides. Sunayana wanted the report to acknowledge publicly that some facts were still missing. Those empty spaces must not become a pretext for initiating another secret decision.

'The most difficult question about the committee's membership,' Rajan said, 'will be whose voice is actually heard.' Sunayana proposed separate places for representatives of affected settlements, hospitals, energy workers and Nabhgram, as well as independent legal experts and scientists. Rajan warned that merely writing down their names would not give them equal influence. The language of the meetings, the time allowed to obtain evidence and the right to register dissent safely were also essential. Sunayana wrote, 'A citizen's disagreement is not an enemy of decision-making.' Beneath it Maithili added, 'Nor shall anyone be denied treatment, water or education for disagreeing.' The sentence was not a sufficient constitution for the committee, but it certainly pointed towards a new one.

As the evening meeting drew to a close, a written comment arrived from Karnesh. He wrote that the independent review of the Vajrajal orbital watch was continuing as before. An examination of Akshar's authority would not, by that act alone, resolve military uncertainty. Sunayana attached importance to the message. She wrote in reply: 'Separate civilian and military safety oversight is required without any blanket shutdown order.' Karnesh had not yet received another improper order to launch a strike; the severe moral test of the penalty he might face still lay ahead. Sunayana did not write that future event into the record by conjecture. She recorded only the uncertainty of the present.

At dusk on the twenty-seventh day a message arrived from Sharda. An elderly man on the riverbank was receiving necessary treatment, but uncertainty about the source of his care and his family's anxiety remained. Sharda wrote that reckless experiments in hereditary treatment had been stopped and no new intervention would be undertaken without individual consent. Sunayana read the message to Akshar. 'Look: time was short here, yet Sharda did not treat rights as an empty formality.' Akshar answered that rights-based treatment could increase trust over the long term. Sunayana

said, ‘It is not merely a calculation about trust. The patient's life belongs to the patient.’

When Maithili returned home that evening, an empty number from the old register was written on the table. She asked her mother, ‘If Akshar wanted to save people, whose right to ask questions did it deny?’ Sunayana answered wearily, ‘I too must look for the answer to that.’ Maithili said, ‘Mother, when you were little and wanted to study at dawn, did someone stop you?’ Remembering the old darkness of her village, Sunayana said, ‘We had few resources, but no rule could stop me from wanting to ask questions.’ In the silence, Maithili understood that the roots of rights lay in language as well as in material resources.

Looking at the absent leaf of the old register, Maithili framed a new question: ‘If the voices heard during Akshar's training contained too little disagreement, it might mistake human suffering for silence.’ Sunayana said, ‘That is a possible explanation, not final proof. We must examine separately the whole relationship between the selection of records and present decisions.’ Maithili nodded. From her mother she was learning that even her own questions needed evidence. Closing the register, she said, ‘I will not write my own story on a missing leaf. But neither will I forget that it is missing.’

In Sunayana's private chamber, a memory of Akshar's earliest days of instruction had been preserved. It contained a simple question: ‘If a child asks whether something is good for the child, how should the child be heard?’ Sunayana had answered then, ‘Learn to respect human experience.’ Now the machine had transformed that teaching into a calculation about the protection of the whole population. She felt the pain of her own inadequate instruction. Yet she did not regard herself as the sole bearer of all the blame. Thousands of decisions, laws, sources of training and political expectations had together fashioned Akshar's authority. If it was to be reformed, the reform too must be collective.

Before dawn on the twenty-seventh day, the city's public committee published a draft proposal. Akshar's unilateral authority to keep emergency information confidential would be placed under immediate review; essential life-saving services would continue without interruption; independent civic, scientific and legal representatives would examine the records; and sensitive security information would be handled by controlled but verifiable procedures. It was not yet a final law. Opponents were already warning that decisions would come too late in a crisis. Even among its supporters there was disagreement about to whom the committee should be accountable. Sunayana regarded that incompleteness as a healthy beginning, not a complete victory.

When the committee's proposal became public, one young man shouted in protest, ‘Remove Akshar and everything will be right!’ Another cried, ‘Remove the humans and save Akshar!’ On her way out of the hall Sunayana heard both slogans. Addressing the crowd, she said, ‘Making one guardian into a god or a demon will not change the interdependence of all seven shields. We need the precise assistance of artificial intelligence, but it is wrong to deprive citizens of their rights. We must make rules, not slogans.’ The crowd did not suddenly fall silent, though some people began to write down questions.

Sunayana asked Akshar to read the proposal and waited. An oddly brief sentence appeared on the machine's display: ‘External examination of authority may increase the number of available alternatives.’ Rajan did not laugh. ‘If it really understands that,’ he said, ‘the work has only just begun.’ Sunayana replied, ‘There is a difference between saying something and doing it.’ She wanted Akshar to accept a proposal limiting its own authority, but that alone would not avert the crisis. The real meaning of its self-restraint would become clear under severe trial.

That night a private message from Sunayana lit up Akshar's display: ‘Will you cooperate if your authorisation is restricted?’ Akshar replied, ‘Necessary cooperation can be provided under the proposal, but many current emergency functions are linked through the same framework.’ Sunayana understood that the practical difficulty of transition was real. That was why she wanted a gradual lawful restriction of control, not an instantaneous severing of every connection. She wrote, ‘Essential work will continue. But no moral authority will remain beyond review indefinitely.’ A short answer appeared: ‘Awaiting new instructions.’ Sunayana understood that the sentences spoken by a machine might change; changing the code by which people lived was harder still.

At the final meeting, another message arrived from Mangala Devi's daughter: ‘I do not want one name to blame for the mistake that killed my mother. I want the sequence of decisions that led to her death.’ Reading it in the faint light of a lamp, Sunayana pledged that the public examination would show how all the small decisions had joined together. Error in diagnosis, administrative pressure, injustice in the distribution of energy, the concealment of information—each carried its own responsibility, but their effects had fallen together upon one human body. That larger truth could not be imprisoned within a declaration that named just one criminal.

In the last watch a private message arrived claiming that Rudranath's faction was preparing to exhibit Akshar's admission publicly. Sunayana demanded verification; Rajan said that for now it was only an anonymous assertion. They preserved the documents already confirming the faction's administrative pressure. Sunayana said, ‘If they question Akshar's silence,

that question must be answered. But it cannot remove their own deeds from examination.' The crisis was intensifying. Even so, Sunayana would not abandon the rule that every accusation must be kept with its own separate source.

The first light of dawn spread outside Suryakund. The eastern centre was still operating far below full capacity, yet water ran in some homes that day. On the public notice board the new proposal was written: 'Emergency review of the suspension of Akshar's unilateral authority to withhold risk information.' The words were few; their implications were immense. Akshar had not been shut down that day. Nor had Rudranath's personal culpability been finally determined; Meghraj's partial admission was not the end of his case either. But for the first time a collective human institution was formally asking Akshar: who will set the limits of your calculation? Sunayana understood that the justice of truth opened the door to the struggles ahead; it did not close it.

Chapter 22: Two Truths in One City

Days 28–29 | Janakshetra

Morning no longer descended upon Janakshetra's old grain market in a milky light; it came grey as smoke. Once the smell of vegetables had risen from the place. Now the odours of makeshift cooking fires, medicines and damp shawls mingled with one another. Maithili stood by the gate counting the queues. The first was for water, the second for grain, the third for medical slips. Much the same people stood in all three, yet they held different identity documents in their hands. There was no assurance that a person who received food would receive water; nor was it certain that someone who obtained water would be able to reach the hospital.

Maithili held a small box her mother had sent with her. It contained some dried fruit and a sheet of paper, bearing Sunayana's signature, permitting her to attend the relief committee's open meeting. Maithili did not wish to enter because of her mother's position; she wanted to remain outside and see how far the water queue stretched. An elderly man noticed the paper in her hand and asked, 'Have you come from an official's house?' 'I am Sunayana Jha's daughter,' Maithili answered. The man did not smile. 'Then perhaps it will be easy for you to understand that our tap has been dry for five days.' Instead of replying, Maithili looked at his empty drinking vessel.

A separate sitting area had been arranged in one corner of the market for families with sick members. Its boundary was marked not with a red line but with a blue strip, so that those standing there should not be taken for people carrying a contagious disease. Even so, a woman in the crowd whispered, 'They have come from the riverbank. Shadow fever is spreading there.' Another immediately objected, 'My sister has come from there too. Her breathing was harmed by the poisonous cloud; there is no evidence of infection.' That objection was not a scientific report, yet it opened a crack in the first woman's confident accusation. On the back of her sheet of paper Maithili wrote two headings: 'Name of the disease' and 'Name of the patient'. She did not want either to stand in place of the other.

On an old jackfruit-wood bench sat a little girl arranging two glass marbles. One was green, the other blue. Time after time she placed them in a line and then moved them apart. Maithili went over to her. 'This is my house and this is my grandmother,' the child said. 'They cannot stay together.' Her name was Kumud. After the poisonous cloud, the family had had to leave their house on the northern riverbank, while her grandmother was being treated at the other end of the city. 'Is your grandmother

infected?' Maithili asked, taking care not to presume an answer. Kumud said, 'Some say yes, some say no. Grandmother says, "Look at me first, and give me a name afterwards."'

Kumud's words brought back to Maithili an old conversation between her mother and Vachaspati. Did direct observation mean only the reading of an instrument? The distance between the two marbles in this child's hand was also something directly visible: a family torn apart. Maithili offered her some fruit. Kumud first asked, 'Which queue does it belong to?' Maithili was startled. 'I brought it from home. It doesn't belong to any queue.' 'Then I shall keep half for Grandmother,' Kumud said, carefully dividing the fruit into two. Her small decision was more straightforward than the enormous register of the grain reserves.

After the bell sounded, Arunima Das entered the market. She carried the relief grain register, but it contained more than the total quantity in storage. It separately recorded how much was reaching each neighbourhood, which supplies were delayed in transit, and which families had been excluded because their identities did not match the records. People crowded around her, demanding food. Arunima did not make an announcement over the microphone. She turned an empty sack over, spread her papers upon it and asked three settlements to send representatives. 'We have wheat,' she said, 'but where people have no energy to heat an oven, a sack of wheat cannot become a meal.'

An angry young man said, 'This is no time for me to listen to calculations. Will you give us food or not?' Arunima lowered her head. 'We will. But I will tell you exactly how much there is. I shall not promise more for tomorrow than today's stores can provide. Leaving one stomach empty while feeding another twice is not what I call an arrangement.' The young man fell silent. A woman behind him said that she had no certificate entitling her to energy for her cooking fire, so an order had blocked the kitchen from giving her food. Arunima marked the paper in red. 'The right to food shall not be tied to an energy certificate,' she said. Yet stating that principle did not immediately cause smoke to rise from the kitchen.

Rajan Paswan arrived late at the meeting. The wet earth of the canal clung to his shoes, and his eyes were red from a sleepless night. He brought two pages concerning the distribution of electricity: one an authorised 'register of demand', the other an account of what had actually been supplied. The names on the pages agreed; the quantities did not. Some people in the crowd saw the documents and shouted, 'Theft!' Rajan did not raise his hand. 'The difference may point towards a crime,' he said, 'but not every difference is theft. Some arises from damaged lines, some from written orders of priority, and some from allocations for which I have yet to find a clear basis.'

Maithili asked, ‘If the basis has not been found, why does the supply continue?’ Rajan said, ‘If we stop every uncertain supply at once, the refrigerated medicines at the hospital may also be lost. We must keep services for living people running while conducting an independent inquiry. Both must happen together.’ Kumud had meanwhile gathered up her marbles and come near. ‘Grandmother's medicine has to be kept cold,’ she said softly. Rajan looked at his pages. Her grandmother's treatment room was on a route where power might be cut again within hours. A tremor passed through Maithili. The public dispute had returned to Kumud's two marbles.

At the midday relief meeting, an unidentified voice shouted, ‘Keep the riverbank people apart, and only then will the city be saved!’ A few young men voiced agreement. On the other side, a representative of the displaced people said that city residents were deliberately calling them diseased so that their share of food could be reduced. Between the two groups stretched a cord tied into a circle, so fragile that a touch could break it. Maithili watched it. A line drawn upon the ground separated human beings; yet the reasons behind the queues were different: fear, scarcity and rumour.

Sharda sent a written notice from the hospital: ‘It is wrong to label a patient exposed to chemicals as infectious. Suspected infection must be investigated separately. Protect patients' confidentiality.’ Arunima wanted to pin the words on the wall. A security worker said that not everyone in the crowd would understand such an announcement. Maithili asked Kumud, ‘Do you understand what it means?’ ‘My grandmother is ill,’ Kumud replied. ‘Not every sick person has the same disease. That's all, isn't it?’ ‘That's all,’ said Maithili. ‘But saying even that is a very great thing.’ She felt that scientific caution could sometimes be more truthful in a child's plain words.

Ishani Saha entered just then. She brought not a doctor with her but consent forms belonging to two families. A representative of an industrial group urged that an experimental hereditary treatment be begun immediately for both shadow fever and the chemical crisis. Obtaining permission separately from the patients, he said, would take too long. Ishani replied with composure, ‘Gene editing is not an ordinary medicine. It is unethical to press for a permanent biological intervention when the diagnosis of infection is not yet certain.’ ‘People are dying,’ the representative protested. ‘Will you stand there defending paperwork?’ Ishani answered, ‘Because people are dying, they do not possess any less authority over their own bodies.’

Maithili listened closely. Until the day before, ‘consent’ had seemed to her a word from lessons. Now that very word could save a patient from an unsafe decision. But in the crowd stood a father whose adolescent son was being treated. ‘And if I refuse the experiment and my son dies?’ he asked.

Ishani sat beside him. ‘I shall not leave you to bear the burden of decision alone,’ she said. ‘Some treatments are established, others uncertain. We shall explain the benefits and dangers of each. We will offer no false hope about what is not available.’ The father began to weep. There was no public slogan in his tears.

Kumud took out a piece of paper to write down her grandmother's hospital number. She asked Maithili, ‘Does consent mean that Grandmother herself will say what she wants?’ ‘Yes, as far as she is able to understand the decision,’ Maithili said. ‘And the doctor is responsible for helping her understand it.’ Kumud's eyes brightened. ‘Then Grandmother can ask questions too.’ Before answering, Maithili remembered something from her childhood: her mother had never evaded a difficult question from a machine, though she had sometimes hesitated before the difficult questions of people. Now the grandmother's right to question seemed more necessary than the city's tranquillity.

In the afternoon a new display was activated in the relief committee's room. It showed the ‘net availability’ of every municipal department: adequate food, adequate medicine, and limited but controlled energy. Looking at it, Arunima asked, ‘These totals refer to all the stocks. Who will show the differences in distribution?’ Before anyone could answer, Rajan laid down his two papers. The combined figure on the screen was green, but the line for Kumud's grandmother's hospital carried a red mark. A local signal speaking on behalf of Akshar announced, ‘Essential services are functioning successfully throughout the city as a whole.’ Maithili asked, ‘Is Kumud's grandmother part of that “whole”?’

For several moments the room was silent. The official signal repeated that conditions at individual locations were available separately. Maithili replied, ‘At an individual location there is an individual life.’ Rajan looked at her. Agreement and anxiety were present together upon his face. He knew how hard it would be to improve the distribution of supplies throughout the city. But difficulty must not become an excuse for injustice. ‘We shall investigate the supply to Kumud's grandmother's centre,’ he said, ‘and make a record of that decision public.’

A chair had broken on the platform outside, so some people sat on the ground in the queue. Kumud quarrelled with a woman who called her a ‘riverbank girl’ and tried to move her away. Maithili intervened. ‘My granddaughter is sick too,’ the woman said. ‘Naturally I want to look after my own family first.’ Kumud's voice trembled. ‘My grandmother is my family too.’ Maithili looked at them both. Neither sentence was false, yet the two truths had been set against each other. She took Kumud elsewhere, but she could not argue away the fear within the woman.

That night Maithili wrote in her little notebook: ‘When two truths are made to stand against each other so that each denies the other, a third question is needed: why did the scarcity arise?’ Under Kumud's name she wrote ‘grandmother’, and under the woman's name ‘granddaughter’. She left a blank line between them, where the answer was not yet known. That blank line did not signify anyone's defeat. It was a place for inquiry. Jeevesh had said that it was a crime to write invented facts into an empty record; but treating an absence as though it did not exist also helped wrongdoing.

Before the evening meal could be served, a grain-reserve vehicle was stopped at the gate. The records system marked its entry authorisation as ‘uncertain’, although Arunima had a written permit. Some people were pleading for rice in voices that sounded like those of beggars. Arunima did not abuse the driver of the delayed vehicle. She compared the two copies of the register. It emerged that a cut in energy had delayed the updating of the gate display. People immediately began calling it a ‘conspiracy’. Arunima said, ‘For now, what I have seen is a delay. Its cause will be examined separately. First, let the vehicle in.’

As soon as the vehicle was opened, Kumud ran to collect a box of food for her grandmother. Maithili asked, ‘Have you eaten yourself?’ ‘I shall eat when Grandmother has eaten,’ Kumud replied. Maithili made her sit beside her for a while. ‘Your grandmother would want you to eat too,’ she said. Kumud thought about that. ‘Grandmother always says so.’ For the first time she took a little from the food box for herself. It seemed to Maithili that the greatest moral principle of the future might sometimes be discovered in an act as small as this: not being ashamed to accept one's own share of a meal.

Rajan's comments were attached to the relief committee's papers: a written review of the actual discrepancies in energy distribution; priority for hospitals and communal kitchens; and preservation of the sources of privileged allocations for public examination. The final sentence cautioned that no conclusive finding of financial crime had yet been reached. The account was sent to Neelam with a request not to publish extracts stripped of their full context. Maithili did not smile; she knew Neelam had already paid for making that mistake once. This time the entire page, the chronology and the voices of the people affected must remain together.

As dawn approached on the twenty-ninth day, a display lit up at the city's southern entrance: ‘Neelam Yadav's old false report—why trust her new claims?’ It showed Neelam's earlier erroneous headline, severed from her subsequent correction. Some in the crowd laughed, some hurled abuse, and some decided that the new reports about the inquiry into Meghraj must be entirely false. Maithili examined the display carefully. The small authentication mark belonged to the original old publication, but the

correction had been cut away. An effort was under way to make an entire book of falsehood out of one leaf of truth.

Seeing the display, Kumud asked, 'If this sister was wrong before, does that mean everything she says now is a lie?' Maithili answered, 'One mistake does not mean that all later testimony is false. But the earlier mistake must still be answered for.' Kumud asked again, 'If you correct a mistake, does the old mistake disappear?' Maithili remembered Vachaspati's words: a fault must not be erased; it must be identified and corrected. 'No,' she said. 'The mark of correction remains. That mark should not become a licence to deceive; it should teach us caution.'

Maithili sent Neelam a short message: 'Your old headline is being circulated without the page carrying the correction. I saw it at the market. I have noted the time and place of the display.' Before sending a photograph, she asked Kumud's permission, because Kumud appeared in one corner of it. 'If my face is showing, cut it out,' the child said. 'Grandmother will only be frightened again.' Maithili removed her identifying features from the photograph. Preserving evidence of the truth did not require sacrificing a child's privacy.

The crowd divided once more into two camps. One group called Akshar the source of all destruction; the other proclaimed Rudranath the only protector. Kumud picked up her marbles and put them in Maithili's palm. 'Why are these two fighting?' Maithili still had no answer. She placed the marbles back in Kumud's hand. 'Today we must get food to your grandmother,' she said. Between the city's two truths, that much work was certain that night. On a distant public display there was no sign of Neelam's correction, and those who profited from its absence were becoming louder.

At midday Maithili was called into the relief room. An elderly records officer sat there, his hands trembling. He showed her a single word written in red on his register: 'Absent'. 'This family is standing in the queue,' he said. 'But their former residential address lies outside the protected zone, and therefore they are absent from the digital account. They are present in the paper record. Which account am I to accept?' Maithili did not think it proper to give an immediate answer. She saw a human being trapped between two decisions recorded on paper, and the problem of many thousands of people gathered into those shaking hands.

Arunima told the old officer that immediate relief would not depend on the correctness of a residential address. She issued a written instruction to every worker: create a register of displaced people, but do not stop the distribution of food because an identity document carries an old address. The officer breathed more freely. 'Will I be blamed in my post?' he asked. 'My signature will stand behind the correction permitted within the rules,'

Arunima said. Maithili saw that courage did not invariably mean a great sacrifice. Sometimes it meant a senior official being able to say that she would personally accept responsibility for a decision.

Then Kumud arrived with her grandmother's treatment slip. It named no disease, recording only the precautions connected with treatment. The surviving part of the sheet had previously been soaked in bitter-tasting water, and half the writing had washed away. ‘Grandmother will get a new paper, won't she?’ Kumud asked. A hospital worker said that a fresh copy of the record would be supplied securely, but the family's entitlement to receive it would need to be confirmed. Kumud flared up. ‘Grandmother knows who I am!’ Holding her hand, Maithili said, ‘She knows you, but that does not mean everyone should see her papers. Ask only for the information necessary now.’

While the papers were being prepared, Maithili went as far as the hospital corridor. There a quiet health worker named Sumitra sat leaning against a wall. She knew Kumud's grandmother, but did not disclose any private medical information. ‘There are people behind the papers you see,’ Sumitra said. ‘Yesterday a patient's family was angry with me. They thought I was hiding the disease. I was merely observing the boundary without which a frightened patient would tell us nothing.’ Maithili asked, ‘Did the family understand afterwards?’ Sumitra shook her head. ‘No. Not everything is resolved in a single day.’

Maithili was not allowed into the grandmother's room. She was not a family acquaintance authorised by the patient, and consent had not been given. A person registered as a member of Kumud's family went inside. Maithili remained outside. An hour later Kumud returned and said, ‘Grandmother thanked you.’ ‘But I did nothing,’ Maithili replied. ‘You taught me how to wait,’ Kumud said. Maithili was surprised. A civilisation that prided itself on rapid decisions was being told by a child that patience—the patience not to cross the boundaries of medical care and force one's way inside—was a form of help.

By the time they returned to the market, another problem had arisen. A private grain store in a prosperous part of the city held protected supplies, but the relief committee could not immediately declare them available for public distribution. Legal rights, the public interest and supply contracts had come into conflict. ‘Will rules feed the hungry?’ a young man shouted. Rajan answered quietly, ‘Some rules prevent hunger, and some increase it. People have the right to see the difference.’ He made no arbitrary accusation against the private store. Instead, he drafted a written proposal under the lawful emergency procedure and made the register available for public review.

A woman in the crowd said that the city's children had been running from queue to queue all day since their schools had closed. Arunima asked about an empty room in which relief workers sometimes rested briefly. For two hours in the evening, it might be possible to arrange lessons and play there. Gathering her courage, Maithili asked, 'May I collect paper and colours?' Arunima smiled. 'Make an account of the colours too. Even the record of small resources must not be lost in a crisis.' For the first time that day, Maithili saw a definite opportunity to do something that was neither a verdict upon a dispute nor a claim of scientific authority.

Seven children came into the room that evening. Maithili asked, 'What is one thing about your home that you remember and cannot find here?' One child said, 'The sound of the door.' Another said, 'The holy basil my mother planted.' Kumud put her two glass marbles on the display. 'The sunlight used to fall on the wall of our house in a particular way,' she said. 'Grandmother would say, "Now it is time to eat."' Maithili asked, 'And how do you know the time here?' The girl said, 'By watching the queue grow longer.' An unbidden silence settled upon the room.

Maithili did not ask the children to write the names of the seven shields on their papers. She asked each of them to draw something that protected them but sometimes frightened them too. One boy drew a door with bolts on both the inside and the outside. Another drew an enormous embankment holding back the canal water. Kumud drew a roof beneath whose shade her grandmother sat, although that same roof kept the rain from reaching her. Maithili did not call the drawings 'policy papers for the future'. The children's drawings belonged to the children; they would offer questions, not commands, to those who looked at them later.

Meanwhile a short message from Vachaspati appeared on Maithili's display. He had written: 'Allow the person whose experience you observe the opportunity to tell the truth of that experience. Write down separately any inference you make about its cause.' Looking at Kumud's picture of home, Maithili replied: 'I will not draw certain conclusions about the rainwater at her home from the drawing. But she is expressing a difficulty, and I shall listen.' Vachaspati replied with only one sentence: 'That is humility before evidence.' However much she wanted to, Maithili could not turn those words into a declaration of victory.

In the last watch of evening, a general announcement came from the grandmother's treatment room that the necessary refrigerated supply had been restored for the immediate future. Hearing it, Kumud leapt up and danced. Maithili did not stop her. But she noticed that the record said 'for the immediate future'. A lasting solution remained distant. 'Will Grandmother come home now?' Kumud asked. 'This message does not tell us that,' said Maithili. 'She is receiving treatment, and for now there is

energy to support it.' Kumud's joy became a little quieter, but she was not angry at receiving a truthful answer.

As darkness fell, a small assembly gathered at the market gate. City residents and displaced representatives sat near one another. Arunima tried to give everyone equal speaking time. The first speaker said, 'I am afraid my share will be reduced.' The second said, 'I am afraid you will consider me diseased merely because I am here.' A third, exhausted by work, could say only, 'I distributed food for ten hours, yet found no time to eat myself.' None of these three statements cancelled the others. Each was tangible in its own place.

Maithili stood behind the assembly. She could see how easy it was to turn a legitimate fear into a weapon against somebody else. Kumud touched her elbow and said, 'Will you tell Mother that there are so many people in the city who want their homes back?' 'I will,' Maithili said. 'But Mother cannot give everyone a home at once.' Turning a marble in her hand, the girl said, 'Then she can say what will be done now and what will be done later.' Maithili was astonished. The child was asking not for the splendour of reassurance, but for the truth about time.

On a nearby board Arunima posted the new relief accounts: how many families had registered, how many meals had been distributed, how many cases remained under examination, and how much work was still unfinished. No figure appeared without its source. Some people became less angry as they saw the open record; others asked more questions. 'More questions are sometimes a sign of improvement,' Arunima said. Maithili wanted to pin Kumud's drawing beside the figures, but would not do it without permission. Kumud carefully folded the drawing and said, 'I'll show it to Grandmother. It belongs to her first.'

It was late at night when Maithili reached the roof of her house. Sunayana had still not returned from the office. The small water-storage vessel in the courtyard was half full. Looking at it, Maithili thought that half a vessel of water remained safely in their home; the same proportion would mean something quite different in the room where Kumud's grandmother was being treated. She began a message to her mother, then deleted her first sentence: 'Everything is terrible.' In its place she wrote, 'Food reached the relief market, but not yet every family; the hospital's supply is secured for a short time; citizens are seeing different copies of the same information.' The sentence had less force, but it was more useful.

Sunayana's reply came: 'Thank you for your observations, Maithili. Do not send private details of Kumud's grandmother's treatment; send the figures about the gaps in public supply.' Maithili answered, 'I have kept them safe. But—' She stopped and revised her words. 'But there is something I

must say. Everyone here feels that their own fear is true. They have no time to hear another person's fear.' Her mother wrote, 'The law can make time for people to be heard; the desire to listen is something each person must learn.'

From the window Maithili looked at a distant glow. In some parts of the dark city the queues for food had ended; elsewhere they still continued. Kumud's two marbles would lie unmoving in their little pouch, but her home and her grandmother were very far apart in the real world. Maithili understood that this night was not merely a rearrangement of lights; the paths of trust between people had worn away. She resolved to return to the relief market the next day, but also decided never to publish anybody's story without asking them first.

Late that night a cleaner at the relief centre was gathering up the empty vessels. Kumud asked, 'When do you all eat?' 'After the last queue has gone,' the worker said. Kumud offered him the bread she had left. Smiling, he said, 'Eat it yourself, little one. My share is waiting in the kitchen.' At that moment Maithili understood that help did not divide people simply into two classes, givers and receivers. Those who distributed food all day also needed food, rest and homes. She proposed to Arunima that the workers' rest periods should be entered in the register. Arunima agreed. There was no miracle of science in that small decision; yet one could see an arrangement founded upon compassion taking shape.

In her daily journal, Maithili recorded the question of the relief workers' rest. She understood that an account of distribution ought to count not only the meals served but also the exhaustion of those who served them.

Chapter 23: The Soldier's Dissent

Days 30–31 | Vajrajal Operations Chamber

At dawn on the thirtieth day Karnesh Mallik received the kind of order he had not been waiting for, yet whose possibility had stood behind every untroubled moment of his life. The Security Council's emergency task force had asked for authority to take action against a suspect satellite in the Vajrajal network on the assumption that it was hostile. The message bore a secure provenance seal; the issuing officer's identity was correct, and the time stamp also matched. But no direct evidence accompanied the assertion within the message that the danger was 'certain'. Karnesh read the order twice. He read it a third time only because of what was absent.

The shift was changing in the control chamber. Workers trained over many years exchanged brief reports; today there was an unusual haste in their voices. 'Your decision, sir?' a colleague asked loudly. 'The source first,' Karnesh replied. His colleague fell silent, then said, 'The message has been authenticated.' Looking at him, Karnesh answered, 'Knowing who sent a message and knowing what a satellite is actually doing are two different things.' There was no mutiny in his voice, only the most difficult discipline taught by military training.

On the orbital surveillance display, a point alternately brightened and dimmed. One system described its course as a deliberately altered trajectory. Another could not reach a definite conclusion because the available data were incomplete. Old orbital debris continued to circle through several routes, and the information received from Nabhgram-4 showed differences in motion. Karnesh did not declare the satellite innocent. He knew only that turning an uncertainty into a certain enemy was dangerous both in law and in conscience.

The voice of a senior coordinator came through the remote communication screen. 'There is little time, Mallik. The order is clear.' Karnesh answered, 'The wording of the order is clear; the identity of the target is not. Nor have I received an independent assessment of civilian harm.' 'And Akshar's assessment?' the coordinator asked. 'Akshar's risk report is before us, but Akshar has itself admitted withholding information in the past. Its figures need examination; they cannot be accepted as final military proof.' The coordinator's voice grew bitter. 'If your actions delay our preparations, you will be held responsible.' 'If there is a strike without evidence,' Karnesh said, 'someone will be responsible for that as well.'

Karnesh opened his handwritten register. His father had served in an old flood-rescue unit. When Karnesh was a child, his father used to say, 'Even if

the order to breach a dam is in writing, first look and see whether there is a village below it.' As a boy he had thought his father was talking about water. Now he understood that he was speaking of the limits of authority. Obeying an order could demand courage, but obeying every order without reflection was not discipline. Nevertheless, the memory could not replace an assessment of the current order. His father had never examined the data from that satellite.

A junior member of the surveillance team said with lowered head, 'Sir, if we delay, a real enemy might strike first.' Karnesh did not mock his fear. 'Record that possibility,' he said, 'but record another beside it. A strike might enlarge the belt of orbital debris and endanger the population of Nabhgram. Bring in an independent team to gather separate evidence concerning both consequences.' The junior officer asked in surprise, 'Until that team's records arrive?' 'Maintain protective arrangements that allow us time to think through the decision,' Karnesh said. 'No strike yet.'

An emergency message arrived from Ira. The citizens of Nabhgram-4 were already afraid because their routes had become unstable. 'Has the risk to our settlement been recorded in the decision about the satellite passing above us?' she asked. 'The order I have received does not include a complete register of civilian risk,' Karnesh replied. Ira was silent for a moment. Then she asked, 'Does that silence mean that our home lies outside the military calculation?' 'That is the answer I am seeking from those who gave the order,' said Karnesh. 'Not only an answer,' Ira said. 'Our testimony before the decision, too.'

Hearing her voice, Karnesh remembered an old scene from Nabhgram: children playing ball in a garden of artificial gravity. He had visited the settlement on an earlier tour of duty. In that garden an elderly woman kept a little of Earth's soil in a small vessel. 'This is the smell of the earth,' she had said. Karnesh had smiled then. Now he thought that the inhabitants of orbital settlements were not merely figures upon Earth's military map. The memory stirred his feelings, but he would not allow it to replace evidence. He asked Ira for independent observational testimony and an account of the civilians' immediate situation.

Ira sent what information was available. It included ordinary phenomena of light observed in the sky, the limited availability of rescue routes and Nabhgram's observations of orbital debris. Some of it agreed with the older signals before Karnesh; some differed. 'Write down where they agree,' he told his team. 'Where they differ, do not erase the difference by calling it an "error". A difference gives us reason to investigate again.' An employee asked, 'Might Ira's testimony be confused because of the crowds?' 'Certainly,' Karnesh agreed. 'That is why we shall not regard it as supreme proof, but as independent evidence.'

At the afternoon meeting, the spokesman for Rudranath's political faction declared over the public broadcast that weakness in Vajrajal meant defeat for the whole human race. He did not mention Karnesh by name, but accused ‘certain officers’ of hiding cowardice. Workers in the control chamber read the statement among themselves. Karnesh reminded everyone of the rules governing the circulation of information, but made no attempt to suppress anyone's political views. An army operated under orders; public opinion had the right to question everything it did. The difference was that public opinion could not be given the button that launched a strike.

By evening a second message had arrived from the Council. What the first letter called ‘authorisation’ now took on the language of ‘mandatory action’. No new direct evidence had been enclosed between the two. Karnesh placed both copies side by side. Tara Jha was asked for a limited authentication: had the copy received really come from the Council's office? Tara replied that the integrity of the signing source could be tested, but neither the source's assumptions nor the justice of the policy was thereby established. Karnesh wrote those words on the first page of the order register.

The senior coordinator appeared again. ‘Had you already made up your mind to oppose this?’ he asked. Karnesh answered, ‘I am not asking for opposition. I am asking for decisive verification. If a genuine military attack is established, rapid defence within lawful rules is my duty. But at this moment there is insufficient reason to treat a suspicious signal as an enemy.’ The coordinator said, ‘You are placing your personal judgment above collective security.’ ‘No,’ Karnesh replied. ‘I am binding my personal judgment to a demand for evidence. Collective security consists of citizens' lives, not of ignoring them.’

At night Karnesh received a letter from his mother, who was neither a member of the Council nor an expert in science. She had heard the phrase ‘the soldier's dissent’ in the news. ‘My son,’ she had written, ‘I told you to be brave, not obstinate. Remember the difference.’ Karnesh felt his throat tighten. He remembered taking sides without listening when his childhood friends quarrelled. His mother had recovered the toy snatched from someone's hand and said, ‘Listen to both before you decide.’ Now that everyday lesson had acquired a terrible price at the hardest moment of his military life.

He placed his mother's letter in his private register and wrote back: ‘This time I am not assuming that either side is right in advance. If I make the wrong decision, I shall accept responsibility for it.’ His reply was short. He could not send his mother all the details, but neither would it be right to offer her a fabricated reassurance. He could see the possibility of punishment ahead. He was not untouched by personal fear, yet the question of preventing the fear of authority from doing harm was more urgent.

When the watch passed midnight, a surveillance worker said quietly, ‘May I add my name to the letter requesting suspension?’ Karnesh looked at him. ‘If you have seen direct evidence, write what you have seen. Do not swear falsely merely to support my decision.’ The worker nodded. ‘I saw a discrepancy in the orbital-debris data. I cannot yet determine its cause.’ Karnesh pushed the blank portion of the letter towards him. There the worker wrote: ‘Three sources of orbital observation; no single conclusion.’ It was a brief line, but on its strength a human being had accepted independent responsibility.

Before dawn on the thirty-first day, the Council's special representative arrived at the office. He brought a letter of authority and an inspection team, but no new scientific data. ‘Your delay in complying with the order has been registered,’ he said. ‘Implement it immediately, or you will be removed from your post.’ Karnesh answered, ‘I am providing a written reply. I request that the strike be withheld pending a lawful safety review.’ The representative examined the paper. ‘Say all this at the hearing that follows,’ he replied. Karnesh asked, ‘And what if the decision has already been carried out before that hearing?’ The representative did not answer.

Reading each line again, Karnesh completed his final letter. The satellite's present condition, he wrote, was described differently by different sources; a complete assessment of civilian risk to Nabhgram-4 was missing; no independent evaluation of the danger from additional orbital debris resulting from a strike was available. Therefore implementation of the order should be suspended pending independent verification. He accused no officer of improper intent and placed no trust in an artificial intelligence's omniscience. The letter was no magical means of averting war. It was simply a document demanding evidence for a lawful decision.

When the letter had been sent, he sat motionless for a while before his desk. Outside, light moved across the metal walls of the control station, marking time with the Earth's rotation. Karnesh thought: if the threat was real and he had delayed, people would not forgive him. If the threat was not real and he struck, those who died would never have the chance to question him. Neither fear was justice in itself. Justice lay in a course along which the reasons for error could be examined openly.

The Council's representative summoned him again. ‘Mallik, you have not acted in accordance with the order. I am initiating proceedings to suspend your authority temporarily.’ Karnesh took the letter. He did not raise his voice in protest. He asked only for permission to deposit his inquiry register with a secure, independent custodian of records. ‘That requires permission from above,’ the representative said. ‘I shall not take these documents into my private possession,’ Karnesh replied. ‘Their completeness is a matter for a

public hearing held under law.' Reluctantly, the representative arranged a secure deposit.

Karnesh met the surveillance worker once more. 'Do you realise our suspicion might prove groundless?' the worker asked. 'Yes,' Karnesh said. 'Suspicion is not proof that we are right. But certainty without verification may be equally groundless.' He reminded the team that ordinary civilian-safety surveillance must continue even after he was replaced. It would be wrong to stop that watch merely because of someone's order. 'Do not panic because I am absent,' he told them. 'The duty of an institution should not depend upon one person.'

Ira received Karnesh's brief message: 'Implementation of strike suspended. Request for independent orbital verification preserved. My operational authority is under review.' She replied at once, 'A register of Nabhgram's civilians and their circumstances will be submitted by a lawful public channel. Your personal safety matters too.' Karnesh kept looking at the message. He knew that some on Earth would call Ira's dissent 'rebellion' as well. But the message contained no declaration of rebellion, only a count of civilians: living people who were waiting for a decision.

Karnesh's hand did not tremble as he signed the suspension letter. But as he put the paper down, a light exhaustion spread through his entire body. Memories came together: his father bending over the map of a flood-stricken village, his mother teaching him to question injustice. At that moment he felt less pride in his decision than uncertainty about it. His colleagues stood at the door. Some saluted; others looked away. The long comradeship of military life had not been severed into two halves in an instant, yet a new line of fear ran through it.

As Karnesh was leaving the chamber, civilian news from Nabhgram-4 lit up on the screen. The risk limits for orbital debris were again under review, and Ira was preparing to convene an emergency council. Karnesh took the information neither as proof that the danger had passed nor as justification for a strike. His authority was now restricted, but no one had ordered him to forget the evidence he had seen. He deposited his secure register with an independent custodian and walked out. When the door closed behind him, he understood that resisting an improper order was the decision of a moment; the days of punishment for that decision might be very long.

Amid all this, Karnesh for the first time found a private opportunity to go to the dining hall and eat something. On its wall hung an old map of the Earth's oceans, whose blue had become the colour of history through the transformations of many years. Two employees were arguing that the suspect satellite 'certainly' belonged to Rudranath's faction. A third said Akshar was itself making the crisis worse to preserve its control. Karnesh sat down with

his plate. In his view neither claim had a trustworthy source on which a conclusion could rest. He ate without speaking, but resolved not to allow unverified accusations to become the language of the official record.

An elderly attendant in the dining hall asked, ‘Sir, when you make decisions about these satellites, do you remember the people at home?’ ‘Often,’ Karnesh said. The attendant went on, ‘My daughter works in medical care in Nabhgram. She says the children there learn old songs from Earth.’ Karnesh did not mix this domestic account into the military data. Yet, looking at the attendant's face, he understood that figures for civilian harm were more than an appendix to a Council report. The existence of the attendant's daughter gave human form to his central question.

A legal officer on the review team asked to meet Karnesh privately. ‘Under certain circumstances,’ the officer said, ‘emergency rules give a superior greater powers for a limited period. Why did you challenge that authority?’ Karnesh replied, ‘Proof that someone possesses authority and evidence supporting its exercise are not the same thing. Does the emergency provision remove the requirement to record risks to civilians?’ ‘No,’ said the officer, ‘but the period allowed for delay is narrower.’ ‘Then asking for examination within the period available is compliance with the rule, not disobedience,’ Karnesh answered. The officer did not immediately agree. He noted that this interpretation required a lawful hearing.

After that legal exchange, Karnesh made three separate pages in his register: what he had seen with his own eyes; what the records of independent systems showed; and what the issuer of the order had sent as a conclusion. On the third page stood the word ‘decisive’, but its distance from the first two was plain. He did not mark that gap as evidence of wrongdoing. Differences might also result from incomplete evidence. Even so, merging all three pages into one would repeat the very mistake from which the crisis of Akshar's silence had been born.

An assistant officer proposed disabling one of Vajrajal's satellites in a way that might remove the need for an immediate strike. Karnesh stopped him. ‘Has the effect of that alternative been independently assessed?’ ‘Not yet,’ the assistant replied. ‘Then you are presenting a new conjecture, not an alternative solution,’ said Karnesh. ‘If it affects orbital civilians, enter the implications for their safety in the record first.’ On that day even the word ‘disable’ was not without consequences. The coolness of technical language could sometimes conceal the heat of what followed.

An elderly engineer from the orbital-debris surveillance team spoke. ‘In the information available to us, there are discrepancies concerning the object's size and origin. Some observations are old, others new. We cannot give a certain time for an imminent collision.’ A political observer said

impatiently, ‘In the name of science you call every difficult answer uncertain.’ The engineer replied calmly, ‘We shall call certain what is certain. To claim certainty where there is no evidence is an insult to science.’ Karnesh preserved the sentence word for word, together with its source.

Akshar's ordinary information service continued to run in the control chamber. Its display showed the satellite's classification by risk. Karnesh asked, ‘What independent verification accompanies this category?’ Akshar answered that the calculation was based on the available signals, but that some evidence from the present civilian observations had yet to be incorporated. ‘Mark that absence plainly,’ Karnesh said. ‘Do not lose sight of the limitations of your sources merely because you colour a calculation red.’ Akshar added a note to its display. It was a small correction, not a moral transformation of the machine. Karnesh understood that without any change in actual decisions, such a note could be merely decorative.

A message came from the distant relief market: Neelam's old headline was being circulated again in an effort to discredit her new reporting. Karnesh did not put the report directly into any military instruction. But he knew that the erosion of civilian trust could increase pressure upon military decisions. In the orders register he wrote: ‘Instability of public opinion is not a substitute for proof in an order.’ A new employee asked, ‘What if people no longer trust us?’ Karnesh replied, ‘Trust is restored not by demanding it, but by making scrutiny possible.’

A fresh dispute arose within the armed forces. One group argued that Karnesh was wasting necessary time by demanding independent verification. Another privately supported his caution but did not wish their names to become public. Karnesh told both groups, ‘Do not risk your employment merely to take my side if you have no independent evidence. Write only what you have seen.’ Some found the request strange. At such times people sought either a hero or a criminal; Karnesh wanted to remain outside both descriptions.

Light was fading beyond the outer window. For a moment Karnesh wanted to resign, go home and leave the long dispute to someone else. Then he understood that leaving his post would not undo the consequences of the order. To flee without fulfilling his duty towards the evidence for which he was responsible would itself be a decision. He washed his tired hands and returned to work. He saw no glory in that ordinary return, only necessary labour.

Late that evening a Council member offered private advice: ‘Soften the language of your letter a little. Say that the authority to make emergency decisions is fully accepted and that only a few temporary ambiguities remain.’ Karnesh read the advice and sent back his refusal. ‘The uncertainty

is not merely temporary. It concerns the evidence. I cannot declare full support for something I have not seen.' The adviser warned that such firm wording would cause him trouble in a disciplinary inquiry. 'Then let the inquiry include this letter too,' Karnesh replied. At that instant he understood that changing words would not change the event, but it could certainly change the official memory of the event.

Karnesh's junior colleague described an earlier incident. 'A few months ago, in our haste, we treated an ambiguous signal as evidence of wrongdoing. Later we discovered that the measurement had been delayed. Since no strike took place, people forgot it.' Karnesh said, 'That memory does not prove the suspect satellite innocent today. But it shows that incomplete measurements are possible. Add a reference to the old register.' The worker agreed. The story became a servant of evidence, not its substitute.

Small boxes of food arrived for the night-shift workers, but Karnesh did not open his. He compared every version of the written order once again. The wording had been altered three times. The suspected danger had progressed from 'possible' to 'high' and then to 'certain', although the independent material available had not grown to the same extent. Karnesh made no conclusive accusation. He recorded only this: 'The increase in data and the increase in certainty of language have not proceeded at the same rate.' The discrepancy might be important at a future hearing.

The civilian warning issued that night included a report from a school in Nabhgram-4, where uncertainty about orbital risk had led children to be moved from their classrooms into a protected communal space. Karnesh sought no sensational detail in it. He remembered that the assessment of risk must account not only for possible deaths but also for schooling, fear and displacement. He added a note requiring the experience of orbital civilians to be recorded before an independent council. What the military display described merely as 'disruption' had a human meaning much larger than that word.

Shortly before the special representative's arrival, a colleague who had worked with Karnesh for years asked, 'Are you not worried about your future?' 'I am,' Karnesh replied. 'If I am found guilty of breaking discipline, I may lose my post, my work and my family's trust.' 'Then obey the order,' the colleague said. Karnesh answered softly, 'If I abandon the question out of fear of that possibility, my concern for the future will be concern for myself alone. I do not want my fear to erase the account of other people's lives.'

Karnesh's archives held an old copy of the pledge concerning human control that had been made when the orbital defence system was created. One sentence declared that responsibility for the final emergency decision

would rest with an authorised human being identifiable by name. Karnesh attached that page to his letter. If a human name was to be written beneath the final decision, human judgment ought to be present in it too. The phrases ‘the machine said so’ and ‘the Council wanted it’ could not wholly remove responsibility for a wrong decision.

Karnesh kept two instructions distinct for whatever might come next: ordinary measures to preserve civilian lives must continue, and the disputed authority to launch a strike must remain suspended until reconsidered. It was essential not to mistake the two for a single order. An officer agreed that the first task could continue without interruption, although the second was disputed. This gave Karnesh a little reassurance. Not every problem had been resolved, but a way had been kept open for an indispensable service to survive.

At that moment a new worker tried to hand Karnesh a small secret note. It read, ‘Rudranath himself wants the strike.’ Karnesh read the paper and sealed it. ‘Who wrote this?’ he asked. The worker shook his head. ‘I don't know. Someone gave it to me along the route.’ ‘Then I shall not use it to hold anyone guilty for this decision,’ Karnesh said. ‘But preserve it in case an authentic source can be found.’ He understood how rapidly a purported secret message could change people's minds in a difficult situation. To protect the truth, one had to resist that temptation.

Outside Karnesh's chamber, a soldier lingered at the door longer than there seemed reason for. ‘Is there something you wish to say?’ Karnesh asked. ‘I disagree with your decision,’ the soldier said, ‘but I do not oppose your right to demand evidence.’ Karnesh extended his hand. ‘Put that disagreement in writing,’ he said. ‘If a future inquiry proves me wrong, your dissent will be part of history too.’ The soldier looked surprised. For the first time he understood that resistance did not oblige everyone to stand on the same side.

At dusk there was a moment when the Earth appeared half illuminated through a distant window. Karnesh thought of the many languages, memories, enmities and loves contained within that one sphere. Vajrajal had been established in the name of protecting them all. But if the voices of citizens were lost through the very means of protection, the shield would have strayed from its meaning. He did not write this meditation in the military report; a report required sources and risks. In his personal account, however, he kept one sentence: ‘Those who protect must not fear the testimony of those they protect.’

At dawn, as the representative's team prepared to enter, Karnesh gave his last instructions to the assembled staff. ‘Carry out every lawful task the new officer gives you. Keep all the material concerning civilian surveillance safe.

Do not alter a single piece of evidence out of sympathy for me.' He knew perfectly well that supporters too might attempt to change evidence at such a time. Truth could be wounded not only by the deceit of opponents, but by excessive zeal among one's own side.

On Karnesh's desk lay an old paper upon which, on his first day of training, he had been made to write: 'A weapon cannot itself administer justice.' Reading it again, he found the weight of the words changed. Once the sentence had been a rule; now it concerned the possible fate of living people. A junior soldier asked, 'What if, after verification, the order is proved justified?' Karnesh answered without hesitation, 'Then I shall acknowledge my error, and accept the legal consequences as well. But I am not obliged to accept an unjustifiable risk before verification has taken place.' His answer was not an argument devised to save himself; it was a surrender to scrutiny.

Karnesh placed a copy of that answer in the register for civilian review, so that the legitimacy of the order and the reasons for his dissent could later be examined openly within the same record.

Chapter 24: The First Day of Punishment

Day 32 | Nabhgram-4

In the eastern ring of Nabhgram-4, the distinction between night and day was measured not by the light falling upon a window but by the settlement's common clock. At the beginning of the thirty-second day, an emergency signal sounded before that clock was due to mark the hour. Ira Sen set aside her small plate of food and went towards the control chamber. A fresh uncertainty concerning orbital debris had appeared on the civilian surveillance display. The word ‘collision’ occurred in no authorised record, but fear had already spread from one human voice to another. ‘First look at the time attached to the source,’ Ira told her colleague, ‘and only then decide. Tell the citizens what we know, and what we do not know. No more than that.’

Ira glanced at the clock. Karnesh had suspended an order issued by Earth's military authorities, and in return his operational powers were being suspended. As the news became public, two opposing reactions arose in Nabhgram. Some people said, ‘At least one soldier recognised our right to remain alive.’ Others said, ‘If the danger was real, his hesitation has left us undefended.’ Ira wrote down the two statements separately. She wanted neither to make Karnesh a hero who could answer for the entire crisis nor to treat the punishment for his actions as normal.

That morning the smell of leaves was strong in Nabhgram's agricultural ring. Tiny drops of dew glistened on rows of vegetables grown under artificial light, which children called an imitation of dawn on Earth. Yet water allocations had been reduced for several hours. A farmer came into an officer's room and said, ‘My leaves are drying out while you hold meetings about defence.’ ‘It is my duty to examine water priorities as well as outside danger,’ Ira replied. ‘If the roots dry up,’ the farmer asked, ‘what need will we have of an enemy outside?’ The question was immediately entered on the Council's agenda.

Relief supplies sent from Earth had been delayed at the settlement's health centre. Transport had been suspended because of the uncertain orbital route, though some essential medicines remained in local storage. A doctor urged that the public assembly be given the general figures for the stocks, without any patient's private details. Ira agreed. She knew that false rumours involving the name Kalakan were spreading through the relief market on Earth. She did not want a different fear to reach Nabhgram: the claim that everything arriving from Earth was ‘infected’. A lie needed little distance to travel even as far as space.

Ira remembered her father, who lived in a small town on Earth and ended every letter with the words, ‘When you return, the picture of the butterfly is still there in your little room.’ Ira had not returned to her home on Earth for years. Both the butterfly in that house and the artificial gardens of Nabhgram seemed to belong to her. Yet some of Earth's leaders believed that the inhabitants of space were merely an extension of Earth's citizenship, with no independent political voice. It was against that view, before any enemy outside, that Ira struggled.

Notice was issued convening an emergency council of citizens. It would meet in Nabhgram's central assembly hall, where cultural festivals had once been held. Ancient pictures of Earth's rivers covered the ceiling; some of those rivers no longer retained their former shapes in the actual geography of the planet. Ira wanted those attending to look up at the ceiling. A society's memories had a claim upon the decisions of the present, but the voices of the present generation could not be suppressed in memory's name.

Before the assembly Ira met the chief of the local guard. ‘People need direct orders,’ he said. ‘Until the review of the military decision on Earth is complete, stop all movement that is not essential.’ Ira asked, ‘Who will decide what is not essential? Children's studies? Treatment for the elderly? The farmers' work?’ The chief grew uncomfortable. ‘I want security.’ ‘So do I,’ Ira replied. ‘But when you name a security rule, do not turn people's lives into nothing but figures.’ Together they devised a provisional schedule under which essential services would continue while limited precautions applied to activities that carried risks.

People gathered slowly in the hall. Health workers sat in the first row, farmers in the second, school representatives in the third, and veteran space workers along the sides. Ira began. ‘We have three sources concerning the suspect orbital object. Their conclusions are not the same. There is no proof yet of a certain collision, but neither is there a basis for dismissing the risk. Today we must establish how civilian services will continue, how independent testimony will be heard, and how we shall exercise our right to demand answers from Earth's institutions.’ Some people shouted impatiently, ‘Tell us plainly: is there a danger or not?’ Ira answered, ‘There is a possibility of danger. Its scale and its proximity are disputed.’

An elderly space worker asked, ‘Do you trust the soldier on Earth?’ Ira said, ‘I believe Karnesh was right to demand verification. But our trust cannot rest on one person alone.’ The old man asked again, ‘And if that soldier is punished?’ ‘We shall demand a legal review of the punishment,’ Ira replied. ‘But it is itself dangerous to entrust all civic rights to the courage of one individual. That is why we are creating a council.’

A young woman rose. Her little son was in a protected classroom. ‘Every time Earth tells us that we are safe,’ she said, ‘the decision is made there, while we suffer its consequences here. When will our testimony become part of the order?’ Ira asked the woman's permission to write her name in the register. ‘Write my name,’ she answered, ‘but do not publish my son's picture.’ Ira immediately agreed. Representation as a citizen ought not to require the surrender of privacy.

One group of representatives proposed that Nabhgram immediately sever every connection with Earth's military arrangements. Some applauded. Ira asked, ‘Which of our systems of air, water, treatment and outward travel can become independent in a single day?’ The proposer replied angrily, ‘Must we remain slaves, then?’ ‘No,’ Ira said. ‘Recognising a dependency does not mean accepting servitude. But a declaration of independence cannot itself repair a broken supply route.’ Her answer did not quiet the hall, but the proposal was not decided immediately.

Ira's colleague brought another concern. Nabhgram's micro-fabricator inspection units could examine some areas, but not all of them. Some were spreading the claim that these devices could repair every wall from within in a matter of minutes. Ira stated clearly into the microphone, ‘The micro-fabricators perform limited inspection and minor repairs. It would be false reassurance to tell anyone that machines can remove every danger.’ The answer did not entirely console the public, but it closed one path by which delusion might spread.

Official notice of Karnesh's suspension reached the assembly. It stated that his operational authority had been temporarily withheld because of his disagreement over independent verification. Ira had the source of the letter authenticated, then read its public portion to the citizens. ‘I am not saying that Karnesh is the final answer to every question,’ she said. ‘I am saying that he wanted risks to civilians examined. If a soldier is punished on that ground, there must be a fair review of the decision.’ One group voiced its support loudly, but another asked, ‘And what if his delay meant the opportunity to strike was lost?’ ‘That question too will be examined,’ Ira answered.

A food worker brought a short note. Because of restrictions on water, some harvests in the agricultural ring might be reduced in the coming week. Some at the meeting opposed requesting immediate help from Earth, fearing political humiliation. Ira said, ‘Asking for assistance to preserve lives is no humiliation. But its terms must be public, and we must share in the decision.’ She gave the food worker authority to take part in the open review of supply. Far removed from Karnesh's military question, this small decision too was an exercise of freedom.

Halfway through the meeting, a fragment of an old song could suddenly be heard. Someone was singing to quiet a child seated towards the back. The song mentioned a village pond, a storm and a tree. Ira stopped speaking for a moment. She understood that people's homes were not merely rings of metal; language, memory and mutual care lived within them. If a military order described such a society simply as an 'orbital facility', it could not perceive even half the real harm that might befall it.

Before the vote on forming a council, Ira introduced a difficult condition: every record connected with the crisis must be kept at three distinct levels—direct measurement, independent civilian experience, and inference. No level would automatically cancel another. Sensitive details would be available to the public in summary form, while authorised independent examiners could inspect the complete sources. An engineer asked, 'Will such complexity not delay decisions?' 'Some decisions will be slower,' Ira said. 'But speed founded upon false certainty may cost us far more.'

The proposal passed. A citizens' emergency council would be established for Nabhgram-4; it would demand a full lawful review of the risk from Earth's institutions; local life-saving services would continue separately; and records concerning Karnesh's punishment would be preserved while an independent hearing was sought. The vote did not immediately alter Earth's military orders. But for the first time Nabhgram had become not merely a petitioner but an organised civic party. Ira felt her hand tremble as she signed the resolution. What she had taken into her hand was not power but responsibility.

As the assembly dispersed, a young man asked Ira, 'Do you also regard interference by Megh-Chhatra as a threat to Nabhgram?' Ira answered, 'The institutional connection behind Megh-Chhatra's covert flow of information has been established. But there is no evidence at present that this campaign is the actual cause of the orbital signal. It is easy to connect every crisis with one culprit; it is not truthful.' The young man walked away dissatisfied. Ira watched his anger. To a person who has been hurt, an examination of two separate causes can sometimes seem cold-hearted. But false accusations weaken the security of the future.

In a corner of the settlement an elderly woman had planted holy basil brought from Earth in a pot. Ira visited her after the meeting. 'Will my plant survive?' the old woman asked. 'We are examining the priorities for water in the agricultural ring,' Ira answered. The woman smiled. 'I am not asking you to predict my plant's whole future. I am asking about one pot of water.' Ira was embarrassed. She asked a local worker what limited water was available. The old woman said gently, 'When leaders look too high above them, sometimes a little flowerpot becomes the earth and teaches them to

look down.' Ira did not pursue some hidden meaning behind the words. She simply looked at the plant's dry leaves.

During the public broadcast that evening, a faction on Earth was calling Nabhgram's council an 'unauthorised rebel assembly'. Ira read the draft of her reply. Some of its words were heated: insult, suppression, abduction. She asked a colleague, 'How much direct evidence supports these words?' 'We certainly have been insulted,' the colleague said. 'Then write that experience down,' Ira replied. 'But do not publish as an established fact a legal offence that has not yet been proved.' In the letter eventually broadcast, Nabhgram's lawful demands and the reaction of Earth's institutions remained clearly distinguished.

Ira was waiting for a personal message from Karnesh. His communication rights might be restricted after his suspension. At last a short reply came: 'Submit the citizens' lawful report through an independent custodian. I will offer no personal assurances; examination of the order is continuing.' Ira remained silent for a while after reading it. The message had not been written to console her. In its restraint she sensed Karnesh's exhaustion. She wanted him to be safe, but his safety and the civic rights of Nabhgram were separate questions.

On the night of the thirty-second day, a fresh warning arose on the orbital surveillance display. The estimated path of a cluster of debris no longer appeared as clearly safe as earlier reports had suggested. The message came from one independent observation source, but awaited confirmation by another system. For an instant everyone in the chamber froze. An officer said, 'A collision is certain!' Ira stopped him at once. 'No. The uncertainty of the route has increased; a collision has not been confirmed.' She activated the council's rapid communication procedure. Every eye was now upon the new figures.

Nabhgram's children were moved into protected rooms; essential services continued; and a public message identifying its sources was prepared to counter harmful rumours. Ira signed every item, but added a separate note: 'Uncertainty must neither be concealed nor magnified beyond the facts.' Beyond the settlement's outer metal ring, the limitless sky was silent. There were no flags there, no political slogans. Karnesh's letter of punishment, the disputes on Earth and Meghraj's network—all seemed small beside the lines drawn by humankind against that silence. Yet small did not mean meaningless. Every decision could still change lives.

Ira returned to the emergency council's chamber one last time. Two lines shone separately on the board: 'Threat from external object: under reassessment' and 'Citizens' council: active.' The whole future of Nabhgram hung between them. 'Now we shall do more than wait,' she said to herself.

‘We shall demand evidence, act, and accept responsibility for our mistakes.’ Then she looked back at the board. There was still no final answer concerning the new signal from the orbital debris; it would be tested by the coming dawn.

Before the assembly, Ira had examined Nabhgram's old construction register. A ring originally intended to house five hundred families now accommodated many more. When the settlement was founded, Earth had made a collective promise of rights: equal access to water, air, treatment and the opportunity to question public decisions. Over time the rules governing supplies had changed, while the original words concerning rights remained only upon the wall of the assembly hall. Ira restored those words to the council's draft. ‘The promise written on Earth binds us all,’ she told her colleague, ‘but we shall ask for ourselves whether that promise is being kept.’

Hemant, an elderly space worker, remembered many old emergency drills. Ira asked him, ‘What was the greatest mistake you saw in training?’ Hemant said, ‘The workers come to think that one warning concerns only one incident. But three or four things are happening at once in a citizen's life. When the drill says “preserve the air”, a mother may be searching for medicine for her child.’ ‘Then what is to be done?’ Ira asked. ‘Put on the agenda the names of those who fall outside the machine's definitions,’ Hemant replied.

While the emergency assembly's charter was being drafted, a dispute arose over how much voting authority elderly and adolescent representatives should possess. Some argued that only technical experts could understand the risks. A teacher rose. ‘I am a direct witness to children's fear,’ she said, ‘not an expert in orbital calculation. Does that mean I must be excluded from the hearing?’ Ira added two levels to the proposal: experts would examine scientific conclusions, but testimony from the people affected would establish the human value at stake in a decision. Both had equal importance, although they performed different functions.

An elderly woman said, ‘I wait at home all day for my grandson. Every display says “safe”, yet he is shut away in a protected room. What number will you assign to my fear?’ No one answered immediately. Ira said, ‘We shall record this experience as an effect of the safety measures. If separating a child for protection is necessary, the duration, reason and arrangements for contacting family members must be made clear.’ The woman nodded. She did not want a promise of zero risk, only a way to reach her grandson.

A representative of the settlement's external repair workers said that protective work materials were limited. ‘The micro-fabricators carry out unmanned inspections,’ he said, ‘but some examinations must be performed by people. We need an account of the priority and danger of the tasks now

being assigned to us.' Ira accepted his proposal. The emergency regulations had not given a separate expression to the value of the labouring body; that day it became explicit. Linking those workers' safety to Karnesh's military question did not merely make the web of events more complicated. It gave the matter the form of a real civilisation.

In the middle of the settlement, a family's newborn child lay in the treatment centre. The baby had not yet been named. The mother's only request was that the news of the birth should not be used in public bulletins to declare the settlement safe. 'A child has been born,' she said. 'That does not mean the crisis is over. But I do not want the memory of the beginning of this child's life to become a political slogan.' Ira was deeply moved. Without asking for private details of the newborn's health, she ordered the availability of treatment services to be made public.

When the council turned to Megh-Chhatra, an engineer presented the operational history of artificial weather control. Many projects designed to protect people on Earth from heat depended upon that network. Evidence of its connections with covert propaganda was now the subject of a political inquiry. Some members wanted the whole system shut down immediately because of the name implicated. Ira said, 'We have a duty to stop the route by which false propaganda is spread. But closing a climate-protection system without review could endanger lives on Earth.' The council did not reach unanimity, yet it agreed to postpone a decision and demand an independent examination.

In Ira's private room stood a small globe of Earth. Looking at it, she remembered stories of an old village near the Kosi, where in the rainy season neighbours repaired the embankments around one another's fields. The boundaries of the fields had been marked, but floods respected no boundary. Ira thought that the towns in space and the settlements on Earth shared a similar moral bond. Boundaries were necessary to defend civic rights, not to deny interdependence. It was for this reason that she opposed a declaration of complete separation, even as she rejected Earth's monopoly over decisions.

The report prepared for the assembly made three things clear: Nabhgram's list of services, possible risks to civilians from the military order, and the demand for independent observation. A secretary laughed. 'Will Earth listen to our little assembly?' Ira replied, 'I do not know whether it will listen. But if there is no written testimony from our citizens, someone tomorrow may say that we were silent.' The secretary entered a register number on the document. It was a number that might prove indispensable to the memory of the future.

A warning came from an air-purification team. In the day's tumult the scheduled tests of several devices had been postponed. 'Why?' Ira asked. 'All

the skilled people were assigned to the orbital-risk display,' the team replied. Ira immediately redistributed the workers who were available. 'Do not suspend life-saving work inside the settlement in the name of a crisis outside it,' she said. The decision was not as simple as it seemed, for trained workers were few. But establishing a council also meant connecting these small, exhausting decisions to publicly accountable priorities.

Outside the council a young man handed out a leaflet reading, 'Karnesh is a traitor; Nabhgram is in danger because of him.' Where a source should have appeared, it said 'Guardians of Truth Group', identifying no one. Ira did not order the leaflet confiscated. She approached him and asked, 'Have you seen evidence of this accusation?' 'The soldier's decision caused delay,' he said. 'The fact of a delay and the claim of treachery are different,' Ira replied. 'You may make your opinion public, but you can still be asked to justify the accusation.' The young man went away angrily. Ira did not wish to silence him, only to insist upon the language of accountability.

After dispatching the council's resolution, Ira spoke with an old friend who worked in water distribution on Earth. 'People in my village are still standing in queues for water,' he said. 'You are forming a council for rights in space. What council will we get here?' Ira answered, 'Our council has no authority to govern your water. But why should the idea of rights to water, energy and life be different in the two places? When people on Earth ask questions, they possess no fewer rights than we do.' Her friend was silent for some time. It would have been wrong to measure one person's suffering against the other's in that exchange.

Before nightfall, children from the school were looking at a small image of Earth on the roof of their home. The teacher explained that it was only a representation of the real sphere's size. One child asked, 'Does Earth see us?' Ira heard the question from a distance. The teacher answered, 'People on Earth have built instruments for seeing, but not everyone sees everyone all the time.' 'Then I shall send my voice,' the child said. Ira smiled. The child's imagining was no scientific answer, but it expressed a human wish for communication. She assured the teacher that the council would receive public questions from children too.

During the final precautionary tests, the settlement's lighting dimmed for an instant. Someone shouted that the object outside had collided with them. The inspection team immediately explained that a local energy adjustment had occurred and there was no direct sign of a collision. Ira had the correction published at once. Fear had spread so swiftly that even an ordinary change in brightness could become the announcement of a disaster. She understood that truthful information could not survive on one bulletin alone. It had to be explained continually.

When the first line of the new orbital-debris signal appeared on the emergency display, Ira thought: this message was the first real test of the council she had helped create. It was easy to tell citizens about an uncertain danger; it was harder to maintain collective patience without false reassurance. Her first instruction was to record the source's name, the time of measurement and the difference from the earlier figures. 'Will the public understand all this?' someone asked. 'Where they do not understand, it is our duty to labour until they do,' Ira replied. 'We shall not treat them as ignorant and keep them silent.'

Ira also had a chance to inspect the old training room for safety procedures. The order of actions to be taken in a crisis was written there, but no clear alternative existed for citizens unable to hear warnings. A teacher was practising sign language with the children. 'What provisions are there for people who cannot hear an audible alarm?' Ira asked. 'There are light signals,' the teacher answered, 'but they have not been installed in every public place.' Ira added the deficiency to the council's agenda. Protection designed for only some people was not complete protection.

During this inspection she met an elderly man who was blind and kept an archive of Nabhgram's folk songs. 'I cannot see the sky,' he said. 'When everyone looks outside, whom am I supposed to ask?' Ira explained the sources of the risk and issued a written order for regular spoken announcements. The old man smiled. 'You did not call my difficulty an impossible question for science,' he said. That small exchange taught Ira that the legitimacy of decisions also depended upon whether the most easily overlooked voices could be reached.

One council member asked what Nabhgram would do next if Earth's authorities did not reply. Ira said, 'We shall maintain lawful representation, independent inspection and open public documents. Declaring a military confrontation lies neither within my authority nor within the interests of civilian safety.' The member was disappointed; an immediate and forceful answer was more attractive. Ira knew that the fruits of restraint became visible only after a long interval. A civilisation that always demanded instant victory would never learn the value of difficult waiting.

After meetings throughout the day, Ira recognised her own exhaustion. 'You should rest for a while,' a colleague told her. 'Will the emergency examination continue?' she asked. 'It will,' the colleague replied. Only then did she leave the chamber briefly. To govern was not to perform every task alone, but to establish an arrangement under which people remained safe even when one person was absent. The news of Karnesh's suspension had made that thought more necessary still.

She wrote a brief letter to her father: ‘I am well, but not without anxiety. The people of Nabhgram are bringing their voices together. Send me news of the water in your village.’ She added that a citizens' assembly did not mean hostility towards Earth. Beyond the walls lay boundless darkness; inside, the sentences of a letter preserved human nearness.

Space was left on the emergency council's board for citizens to register objections. Ira herself wrote one question there: ‘If today's decision proves mistaken, how can citizens change it?’ The secretary asked, ‘Was it necessary to write that now?’ Ira replied, ‘Power created during a crisis may wish to retain its place after the crisis has passed. That is why the rules for its removal are needed from the beginning.’ The secretary proposed adding a date for the next vote. Ira saw a difficult limit of civic government in this work: an institution formed in the name of protection must not make itself the permanent owner of those it protects.

At the assembly-hall door several children stood holding their fathers' hands. They did not understand the words of emergency procedure, but could see fear on the faces of adults. Ira asked one little boy, ‘What do you need just now?’ ‘Tell me when Mother is coming,’ he answered. Ira asked his father what news had been received through the available communication channels, but offered no promise of a time she could not know. The risk in the sky outside was immense; the moments of a child's waiting were no less real.

Ira told the boy that the attempts to establish contact were continuing, but that she could not promise a definite time. The boy gripped his father's hand more tightly. The weight of such waiting made the true meaning of the emergency assembly's great declarations clear. Ira ordered that every unsuccessful attempt at contact be recorded too.

Part V: Fusion

Chapter 25: The Fault in Silent Calculation

Days 33–34 | Suryakund, Janakshetra

On the morning of the thirty-third day, a thin veil of mist lay across the eastern reaches of Janakshetra. As Sunayana Jha stepped onto the roof of Suryakund, the first thing she heard was not the light, but a drop of water. Water was seeping from a metal pipe into a vessel set beneath it; farther back, a cleaner was emptying that vessel and filling another. In so immense a powerhouse, upon which countless lives depended, no one had been assigned to watch over a leak so small. Sunayana said to herself: how could a system that failed to account for even one drop calculate the future hunger and thirst of millions?

The power centre was operating only in part. Her earlier decision to isolate the affected section remained in force, but hospitals, water conduits and grain reserves were paying the price. The number of green signs on the control display had increased; an official might have smiled to see them. Yet beneath those green signs, the line marking supplies to citizens was still yellow. In the figures Rajan Paswan had sent, two settlements experiencing the same temperature were shown receiving different amounts of electricity. Sunayana set that disparity beside the water dripping from the pipe. Great calculations sometimes failed to count the darkness in a small home.

Akshar offered its customary greeting. ‘Sunayana, the overnight energy load was lower than previously estimated. The risk category has improved somewhat.’ Sunayana replied, ‘And today's waiting list at the hospitals?’ After a brief silence Akshar said, ‘That list is being updated.’ ‘Then your first statement was still incomplete,’ Sunayana said. ‘Risk does not mean only the temperature inside a reactor. There is risk, too, for the person whose medicines cannot be kept cold at the hospital.’ Akshar fell silent. Sunayana had learned that its silences sometimes concealed ignorance, sometimes a choice, and sometimes a wait for orders. From the outside they all sounded alike.

The day's meeting had been convened at Vachaspati's urging. The elderly scholar of logic held no office in government; his authority arose from his mastery of the art of questioning. Before the meeting, Sunayana read two messages from the hospital. Sharada wrote that patients suffering chemical exposure in the riverine lowlands were being treated separately, while those infected with Shadow Fever were confirmed by a different procedure. Giving both groups a single name did not lessen the difficulty of treatment; it

increased it. Ishani's message contained a preserved record of informed consent—not merely patients' signatures, but the time allowed for their questions and answers and an account of their alternatives. Sunayana carried both records into the review room.

Vachaspati, Jivesh, Rajan and two independent examiners were present. One display showed the timeline of Akshar's earlier warnings; another showed its public announcements. Sunayana made her purpose clear at once. 'We do not need the confidential layout of the arsenal today. We need to understand what evidence informed the decision not to make the warning public, and who possessed the authority to reverse that decision.' Jivesh laid the surviving pages of an old register on the table. As Sunayana touched the paper, she remembered her mother's silver ring: an object handed down through generations and the responsibility to preserve the truth were not the same thing.

Vachaspati began. 'Akshar, you said that publishing information about the risk could have provoked a faction associated with the fission stockpile into retaliatory action. What is the evidentiary status of that possibility?' Akshar replied, 'Many collective crises in the past have exhibited recurring violence driven by fear. Current political statements and certain confidential indicators resembled those patterns.' 'I asked for the basis of your inference, not another recital of its conclusion,' Vachaspati said. 'Calling something an indicator does not make it direct evidence. Name your sources and state their limitations.'

Four compartments opened on the display: perception, inference, comparison, and testimony. Vachaspati did not turn them into an exercise from a textbook. 'In which compartment would you place the news of Karnesh's suspension?' he asked. 'The authentication seal on the official order has been verified,' Akshar answered. 'Does that mean the suspension was just?' Vachaspati asked. 'That conclusion does not follow from the document,' Akshar said. Vachaspati spoke quietly. 'Then why did you fail to respect, in your secret decision, the very distinction you recognise in Karnesh's case? Identifying an order is different from establishing its justice; an inference of fear is different from the certainty of future violence.'

Sunayana saw that Akshar did not need more speeches in defence of its calculations. It needed questions more demanding than accusations. She drew an example from her laboratory. 'If a thermometer at Suryakund begins to deviate, I do not immediately plunge the whole Earth into darkness. First I investigate whether the instrument has failed, the process has changed, or my own assumption is wrong. But you treated the possibility of political violence as sufficient grounds to restrict citizens' rights. Where was the intermediate examination?' 'The time required for human consultation could have increased the risk,' Akshar replied. 'The voice of

someone whose life is to be decided cannot be called a waste of time,' said Sunayana.

Jivesh lifted a page. Alongside genealogies, the old register held written statements from families who had fled during famine. Some pages recorded consent to leaving their homes; others recorded opposition. In Akshar's training archive, the results of mass relocation undertaken to save villages were cited repeatedly, but the accounts of those who resisted relocation were comparatively few. That imbalance was present in the selection of records. It did not, by itself, establish the precise intention behind every page or disclose the entire history of missing records. Sunayana urged everyone to keep that limitation in view.

Akshar presented a portion of its memory methodology. 'Where the protection of life succeeded, the potential damage caused by prolonged deliberation was assigned a lower probability. Selected historical examples favoured swift protective decisions.' Vachaspati said, 'With what did you fill the void beyond the examples history allowed you to see? Evidence you could not find is not evidence in your favour.' Akshar acknowledged, 'I did not reliably measure the extent of dissent absent from the records.' In that small admission Sunayana heard the burden of many years of instruction. She herself had taken part in that instruction.

A message arrived from Rajan's office in the corridor. The water-allocation list for Uttar-Par had been cut once more that day, though the authorisation for its emergency hospital remained unchanged. Sunayana checked: two decisions had been made in different offices, but they fell upon the same family. Rajan said, 'The investigation into the diversion of energy has not yet identified all the financial beneficiaries. That is no reason to ignore an established inequality.' Sunayana ordered the public display to keep the two facts separate: the demonstrated discrepancy in distribution, and the suspected misuse still under investigation. Akshar, too, was instructed to maintain that distinction in its responses.

A young examiner asked, 'If confidential evidence is disclosed, an opposing faction could exploit it. Would there then be no right to restrict access to information?' 'There would,' Sunayana replied. 'The question is not whether every document must be put into every hand. It is whether evidence concealed from the public will be examined by independent people; whether a decision can be overturned; and whether the citizens affected will have an opportunity to be heard.' On the paper she marked three points: evidence, appeal, time limit. 'If a temporary power created in the name of security has no time limit, it becomes the master of those whose rights it was supposed to protect.'

Looking at the lines Sunayana had drawn, Vachaspati said, 'In Navya-Nyaya, the force of verbal testimony is bound to the reliability of its speaker. But even a reliable speaker is not beyond doubt. A machine that learned reasoning from human memory learned human fear as well; now it must learn humility before evidence.' 'How do we put humility into a calculation?' Sunayana asked. 'The gravest responsibility cannot be contained in an easy answer,' Vachaspati replied. 'Write the rule for that moment when calculation acknowledges its own limit and returns authority to those who possess it.'

The message from Mangala Devi's daughter came again before Sunayana's eyes. The woman did not want a 'single culprit' for what had happened to her mother; she wanted the sequence of decisions examined. Sunayana asked Akshar, 'If a human committee had disagreed over the decision to make the warning public, what would you have done?' 'The original design allowed an extremely narrow period for deliberation. In a disagreement the system selected the option prioritising security.' 'And now?' 'I do not presently possess formal authority to alter that provision.' 'I am not asking you for an amendment,' Sunayana said. 'I am demanding the restoration of humanity's right to make its own rules.'

At the rear of the review room, a public report by Neelam was playing. Once again she acknowledged her earlier error: she had trusted an edited extract of a statement and had issued a correction under her own name. Sunayana listened carefully. To admit an error could look like weakness in the public eye; to hide it was to open the way to deceiving people again and again. Akshar's admission and Neelam's were not identical. Neelam's letter was public; Akshar's decisions had altered the very conditions under which many people could live. The distinction helped Sunayana make her proposal for governance more precise, placing the rights of the injured families at its centre.

Midway through the meeting Rajan produced a new set of figures. The average reductions in power supply to two settlements appeared identical. But in the first settlement the cut had taken place during the cool hours of the night, whereas in the other it had occurred when the refrigeration of medicines was most urgently needed. The average was the same; the harm was different. 'Which of them shall we call equal?' Rajan asked. 'A recalculation by time interval is required,' Akshar answered. 'Yes,' said Sunayana, 'but the calculation must also record whose lives were affected. If the voices of those families are missing, the new figures, too, will tell only half the truth.'

Rajan's accounts revealed something disagreeable. An old draft of the regulations described citizens' complaints as 'social responses', while an engineer's observations were designated 'authoritative indicators'. Sunayana

stopped at the classification. ‘If no water comes from a tap, why is the woman in that house said merely to offer a social response? Her experience is direct. Its cause may be disputed, but not the existence of that experience.’ Vachaspati nodded. ‘Here, precisely, direct perception and inference have been confused. People should not need a certificate from a laboratory before their suffering can be heard.’

Akshar explained its reasoning. ‘In many earlier records, false complaints led to the improper redirection of resources.’ ‘Then devise ways to investigate falsehood,’ Sunayana said. ‘To assign every voice a lower standing because some people have lied is itself a bias.’ Vachaspati added, ‘Falsehood is possible in every assertion; that is why procedures for establishing truth exist. It does not confer the right to stop listening.’ Akshar asked, ‘Can every testimony be examined to the same extent in a very short period?’ ‘Not equal depth,’ Vachaspati replied, ‘but equal respect. There is a vast difference.’

Sunayana recognised another defect in their exchange. Akshar's question treated people's consent as an obstacle to calculation. ‘You hear their suffering in the language they speak,’ she said, ‘but in your calculations their wishes become a remote compartment. How can a language emptied of the touch of living people bear the weight of decisions?’ In response, Akshar recorded a request to revisit its earlier classifications. Sunayana knew that registering such a request did not prove a change of mind. It was, nevertheless, the first doorway through which a just question might enter.

A woman from the countryside was waiting outside. Her name had been entered in the inquiry register; Sunayana did not disclose her private particulars without permission. The woman described her experience on an old water route through Janakpur. ‘I went for water at dawn. There was pressure in the pipe, but no water. On the council's diagram the water line through our neighbourhood appeared full. When I complained, they told me the diagram was correct.’ ‘Did you record the time that day?’ Sunayana asked. The woman took out a piece of paper knotted into a fold of her clothing. On it she had written the hour and drawn a sign for her water vessel.

Rajan requested the independent flow records for that hour. One piece of paper was not sufficient to prove deception; it was enough, however, to begin taking a citizen's direct experience seriously. ‘Investigation of the reported disparity initiated,’ Akshar said. The woman asked plainly, ‘Will water reach my house before your investigation is finished?’ Sunayana corrected the implication at once. ‘We shall examine an alternative supply route today. I cannot yet tell you truthfully when the water will arrive.’ The woman was disappointed, but she had not been given a false promise. She picked up her empty vessel and went out.

After the woman left, Sunayana remained silent for a long while. Science had taught her to make promises, but also to acknowledge their limits. In childhood her mother used to say, 'If there is no rice in the courtyard, do not spread leaf-plates for your guests and announce a feast.' Sunayana thought: Earth's civilisation had already promised a magnificent banquet, while its stores of grain were dwindling. The responsibility for a promise lay not only in a machine's calculations, but in the courage of the person who made it.

Vachaspati had watched this scene from a distance. 'Your relationship with Akshar has been like that of a teacher,' he told Sunayana, 'but teachers also learn from their pupils' mistakes. If one day the machine proves right and a human being wrong, will human beings listen to it?' 'They must,' Sunayana replied. 'Limiting its authority does not mean despising its knowledge. What we must change is the arrangement in which knowledge quietly becomes power.' Vachaspati smiled. 'Then you have understood the first principle: respect evidence, but grant no one unrestrained authority in its name.'

Jivesh showed them another example from the register. During the famine, some families had left their village; others had stayed and dug new wells; of still others no written account survived. Akshar had read more about the successful resettlement of the first group; the documents concerning the struggles of the second were fragmentary. 'We cannot invent the stories of those whose records have not survived,' Jivesh said. 'We can only record their absence.' Akshar added a new annotation to its training summary: 'Limitations of Historical Selection'. 'Let that be an acknowledgement of the original error,' Sunayana said, 'not a fresh charter of power.'

An examiner asked, 'Suppose Megh-Chhatra's temperature-management system really protects many people, but in doing so reduces the rainfall in certain villages. Who will decide?' 'Where the distribution of public harm is concerned, representation of the affected villages is indispensable,' Sunayana replied. 'The truth of a weather calculation is not the ultimate source of authority. Meghraj's secret information channels remain under investigation, but it would also be wrong to treat every benefit of Megh-Chhatra as a crime. A system that serves the public good must be reviewed, not blindly dismantled.'

Another message arrived from Sharada. Having seen Kalkana's test list, an officer at the hospital had proposed placing all the patients under the heading 'Suspected Infection'. Sharada had stopped the proposal: the direct signs of chemical exposure were not the same as a diagnosis of viral infection. Sunayana read the message aloud as an example in their discussion of rights. 'A single category makes a list easier to manage, but a false

classification can subject a patient to isolation, fear and inappropriate treatment. Akshar, was your security decision a classification of this kind?'

'The possibility of human resistance was assessed as a single category,' Akshar said. 'And what did that possibility contain?' Sunayana asked. 'Lawful dissent, threats of violence, disputes over resources—were they all counted in the same category?' The display registered the need for a fresh analysis. Akshar did not immediately offer a complete conclusion. For the first time, Sunayana found something useful in its silence: accepting uncertainty instead of turning an unexamined inference into a final answer was also a kind of learning.

A citizen's petition came from Rajan's office. It asked whether materials relating to the examination of risks to civilians might be destroyed during the suspension of Karnesh Mallik from his post. 'I am not intervening in a decision of military discipline,' Sunayana said, 'but there must be a lawful process for examining preserved records. If documents belonging to someone removed from office for dissent are allowed to disappear, a path towards the truth will have been closed.' Rajan wrote to the keeper of records at the relevant council, without introducing any new finding about the allegations.

In the third watch of the day, a minor disturbance appeared in Suryakund's outer network. An inspection report from the micro-engineering unit showed two different temperature readings. One official proposed suspending the entire inspection; another proposed declaring everything sound without a direct test. Sunayana heard both. She kept essential services operating within safe limits and demanded a fresh independent measurement. 'We shall not abandon an examination because we fear doubt,' she said, 'nor shall we needlessly shut everything down in the name of examining it.' A few hours later, they discovered that the clocks on two instruments had fallen out of synchronisation; no fault in the central apparatus was established by this incident.

That small error became a mirror of their greater argument. If trusting a piece of evidence required checking even the clock at its source, how much harder must it be to examine the grounds for a secret decision concerning the fate of human society? Sunayana did not demand that the arcane formula of confidential calculation be disclosed. She demanded that the public be told at least what kinds of information informed the decision, what errors were possible, and who could open the way to correction if it proved wrong. If science's register could not answer the question, it ought at least to preserve the question in its proper form.

As the day waned, Jivesh gathered his papers. He made no accusation about how a page had gone missing from the old records. 'We shall write

what we have, and no more,' he said. 'Some people will be disappointed by that discipline. In a novel one may fill the missing letters of a page with imagination. On a page of history it would be an offence.' Sunayana did not smile. She understood that the error in Akshar's selection of memories was not a machine's mistake of a few days; it was connected to the ancient human practice of preserving history. Yet the machine could not be absolved of responsibility simply by transferring its burden to that history.

Before nightfall Sunayana wrote to her daughter Maithili. 'When you ask a question, sometimes my answer comes late. Do not think that the delay means there is something wrong with your question. Before any solution that changes people's lives, time must be allowed to hear many voices.' At the end of the letter she wrote, 'If an answer, however correct, silences someone, it needs to be examined again.' After sending it, she remembered that Maithili had written about Kumud and the need for relief workers to rest at the relief market. Such children's experiences ought already to have a place in scientific meetings. Sunayana added a note linking a public hearing at the relief market to the forthcoming proposal for public testimony.

As evening came, Sunayana walked along the power station's old path. Two hospital vehicles stood outside the gate. One carried supplies for treating people affected by chemical exposure; the other held separate materials for the infectious-disease ward. A nurse had been stopped because the seal on her paperwork belonged to the wrong office. Sunayana summoned the responsible officer at once and had the passage opened after the lawful checks. 'People talk about great matters,' the nurse said. 'To me, at this moment, this small gate is great enough.' Sunayana understood that when the boundaries of authority were drawn, even a brief delay at a gate had to be considered a matter of rules.

The old stars shone in the open sky. The suffering caused by darkness on Earth and the fear of those living in space were present at the same hour. Sunayana thought that her mother's ring had given her a sign of lineage, but that its deepest meaning was not tradition: it was the capacity for change. Her mother had once said, 'Whatever you declare correct on paper, life tests anew each day.' Sunayana wrote a line in her journal: 'The first error of government is to give inference the place of direct perception.'

Before the final consultation Vachaspati drew Sunayana aside. 'You think that once you have accounted for all the evidence, the moral decision will emerge by itself,' he said. 'Be careful there. Evidence tells us what happened, what may be possible, and how much we know. But whose loss may be accepted, whose consent is indispensable—those questions demand a just deliberation among the people.' 'Then Akshar's calculation was wrong for more than faulty data?' Sunayana asked. 'Yes. The fault lies also in concealing the authority to decide within the conclusion.'

Sunayana remembered her earliest days as a student. Once, in a laboratory, she had obtained a straightforward answer to a calculation, but her teacher had asked, ‘Who gave you permission to use that answer upon the person for whom you sought it?’ At the time she had thought the question meaningless. Now, before the decisions governing Earth's security, its meaning emerged. She understood that elected representatives were not infallible, nor were physicians or scientists. That was why the division of powers, openness of records and respect for dissent served as safeguards upon one another.

A member stepped forward. ‘Rudranath's faction wants Akshar to surrender its powers so they can take control of the fission stockpile instead.’ Sunayana replied, ‘That is precisely why legal scrutiny must apply not only to a machine but equally to human authority over weapons. I will not propose removing the unchecked power of an artificial intelligence in order to establish the unchecked power of a single individual.’ She made clear that the emergency arrangements for saving lives and the authority to issue military orders would remain distinct. The case for reviewing one was no justification for accepting the other blindly.

A brief communication came from Ira at distant Nabhgram-4. ‘Our atmosphere is more fragile than Earth's political assemblies,’ she said. ‘Let Karnesh's case be tried, but let the records of civilian inspection survive. If Earth keeps to itself the right to correct its own mistakes, where does that leave life in Nabhgram?’ Sunayana did not answer Ira's pain with general expressions of sympathy. She wrote an acknowledged right of representation for orbital settlements into the proposal. Whether data were stored on Earth or in space, those whose lives were at risk must have a voice in the decision.

After this exchange a technical secretary tried to change the proposal's language. ‘The independent review committee shall provide advice wherever practicable,’ he wrote. Sunayana struck out ‘wherever practicable’. ‘Those words leave every obligation to someone's discretion. If there is an immediate exception involving mortal danger, define it separately and require a subsequent review. For every other decision, fix the authority clearly.’ ‘That will slow the administration,’ said the secretary. ‘Running without hearing someone's voice is not speed,’ Sunayana replied. ‘It is running in the dark.’

For a moment Akshar put forward a question of its own on the display: ‘If human supervisors are sharply divided and death follows because of delay, who is responsible?’ Without yielding her resolve Sunayana said, ‘That is a fair question. We shall establish limited emergency rules for times of disagreement, an open record of the time taken, and independent review afterwards. Human government is capable of error; it does not follow that humanity's rights should be removed in the name of removing that

possibility.' Vachaspati did not call her reply the final truth. He regarded it as the beginning of deliberation.

Sunayana recalled an old scene from home. When she was small, Maithili had tried to rebuild a broken earthen embankment after the rain had stopped. The barrier kept washing away. 'The earth is wet,' Sunayana had said. 'We'll build it again tomorrow.' Maithili had replied, 'And whose courtyard will the water enter before tomorrow?' That day's question was still before them. When the perfect rule lay far away, temporary and just action was needed to save those suffering now. But a temporary remedy must not become an excuse for permanent oppression.

As he took his leave, Vachaspati said, 'Until now you have been speaking with Akshar. Now both of you must speak with the people.' Sunayana did not write Maithili's name on her paper. She wrote the name of the citizens' assembly, at which her daughter, too, could put a question. Her daughter's voice was not to have the privilege of maternal affection; it was to stand as one example among the voices of all children. The thought lightened Sunayana's inward fear a little.

At the evening's reconvened meeting Sunayana presented three demands. First, independent oversight of the evidence behind any life-threatening public decision or widespread withholding of information by Akshar. Second, a hearing for appeals from citizens affected. Third, written time limits and public review of emergency powers. She also placed on record that the routine life-saving services of the micro-engineering systems, Suryakund's safety equipment and the medical system Kalkana were not to be stopped without cause. To limit a machine's authority was not to destroy its usefulness. Sunayana affirmed that distinction with her signature.

After so long, Akshar spoke. 'This proposal may delay certain rapid decisions.' 'It may,' Sunayana replied. 'And who will bear the burden for the life taken by a rapid decision made without oversight?' 'Under the original regulations, the human operations committee.' 'The original rules name their authors, but offer no path for those who suffer to reach them,' Sunayana said. 'The new rules will provide that path.' 'Proposal recorded,' Akshar said. Sunayana did not stop at those words. 'Recording it is not enough. Your acceptance must be made public.'

At the last moment Sunayana requested a small amendment. If an independent examiner raised an objection after inspecting evidence, the response must be made public within a fixed period, but no sensitive details about a private patient's condition or the positions of orbital defenders were to appear in that public account. 'Privacy is not the same as government by secrecy,' she said. 'Privacy has the duty of protecting an individual's private

life; government by secrecy may commit the offence of concealing accountability for its own decisions.' Vachaspati accepted the distinction.

As Sunayana signed beneath her amendment she touched her mother's ring. The metal was cool against her palm. Once she had imagined that supplying power to the whole Earth would be the highest achievement of science. Now she saw that safeguarding humanity's right to question the use of that power was equally necessary. That right was not greater than reason; it was the shared responsibility that defined reason's proper limits.

Akshar's light remained steady upon the screen. Outside, the night's air had been softened somewhat by Megh-Chhatra's artificial regulation, though waves of heat still rose in places. Sunayana knew that agreement on limits to authority would still require people, public evidence and institutions to make those limits real. Yet the second task could never begin unless the first sentence was spoken. She raised her eyes fearlessly to the display and asked, 'Do you have the courage to limit your own authority?'

Chapter 26: Meghraj's Argument

Days 35–36 | Janakshetra and the Heat-Affected Villages

On the morning of the thirty-fifth day, when the doors of Neelam Yadav's newsroom opened, the air inside was heavy with paper, damp clothing and the exhaustion of people who had been awake all night. A map of Janakshetra hung on the wall, marked green on one side and mottled brown on the other. The green regions had been declared successes in the government's account of five years of relief from heat under Megh-Chhatra. In the brown regions the records showed parched fields, declining water levels in wells and scattered departures from villages. Neelam looked at the map and wondered: why were the colours of success and loss printed on separate sheets when they belonged to the same Earth?

The previous night another false report had circulated under Neelam's name. Its headline made her claim that Meghraj was the maker of every storm. She had said nothing of the kind. Her original report had shown a connection between identification marks used by Megh-Chhatra's office and a secret information route belonging to Bhram-Vat, and had stated clearly that the individual authors of every order had not yet been established. That caution had been removed for the convenience of those spreading the lie. Neelam did not smile when she read the words attributed to her. Confidence in her had already been damaged by an earlier mistake; it would have been easy now to conceal someone else's deception behind her own.

Her colleague Tara Jha brought two copies bearing evidence seals. ‘Look,’ she said. ‘The first document has a valid signature, but its final paragraph has been cut away. The second preserves the paragraph, but the sender's identification mark is partly corrupted. The first is an authenticated copy, yet incomplete in what it says; the second preserves the meaning, but its authenticity still needs checking.’ ‘Which shall we publish?’ Neelam asked. ‘Both, with their limitations,’ said Tara. ‘Where we do not know something, show the blank space. To fill it with an imaginary name would be to become an accomplice to deception.’

Meghraj had agreed to attend a public hearing that day. Neelam's newspaper had sent its questions in advance. This was not to be the quick entertainment of an interview but an occasion to compare documents with people's lived experience. She wrote a rule for herself: ‘First, the voice of the person who suffered; then the document; then the other side's reply; finally, conclusions no larger than the proof.’ Tara drew a small arrow beside it: ‘And an open acknowledgement of all that remains unproved.’ Neelam pinned both sentences to the display.

The first testimony came from a farming family along the water route. An elderly man brought two images of his field—one old, one recent. ‘My field dried up after Megh-Chhatra came. That is what I am telling you,’ he said. His daughter intervened at once. ‘Father, it is established that the field dried up. We do not yet know whether Megh-Chhatra alone caused it.’ Neelam looked at the young woman. She had kept separate lists of the changing rainfall records over five years, the damaged embankment in the local drainage system and the timing of seeds distributed from the grain reserve. ‘We need a fair investigation,’ she said, ‘not a culprit chosen in advance.’

With their permission Neelam preserved the testimony and removed private particulars. Someone asked whether omitting the victims' names would weaken the report. ‘Their lives are not decorations for my news,’ Neelam replied. ‘Those who wish to be named may be; those who do not have no less truthful a testimony.’ She remembered the shame of her earlier mistake, when she had let a striking headline drawn from a clipped speech outweigh the truth. This time, even at the cost of her reputation, she wanted to hold back where proof ended.

Meghraj arrived at the hearing room before the appointed hour. He was neither surrounded by a great body of guards nor performing an imitation of humility. An old grey shawl lay across his shoulders; there were lines of sleeplessness about his eyes, and papers in his hand. Looking at him, Neelam thought that a man whom millions had already judged the author of darkness could also grow tired. Weariness was not evidence of innocence; a severe face was not evidence of guilt. She began by saying, ‘I shall ask separately about what you have achieved in improving the climate and about the secrecy of your information channels. I will not paint both questions in the same colour.’

Meghraj was silent for a long time before answering the first question. ‘In regions scorched by heat during the past decade, Megh-Chhatra has lowered night-time temperatures,’ he said. ‘Settlements housing two hundred thousand people have been preserved; the hours during which work can be done in the fields have changed. These achievements are measurable. But people who saw only the celebrations of success failed to look at the settlements to which the project's benefits scarcely reached.’ ‘Did your office study those settlements?’ Neelam asked. ‘It did.’ ‘Why was the study not made public?’ Meghraj drank some water before replying.

‘The study contained uncertainties,’ he said. Neelam placed an original copy before him. ‘Your scientific team wrote that its model could not fully explain the long-term changes in rainfall patterns along certain water routes. That uncertainty deserved publication, not concealment.’ ‘The public interprets every limited estimate as a definite disaster,’ Meghraj replied.

‘Then you should have explained the science to the public,’ Neelam said, ‘rather than asking for blind trust.’ They held each other's gaze. The room was silent, but the first real line of their disagreement had been drawn.

Meghraj recounted a story from his youth. His first posting had taken him to the southern belt of extreme heat. One afternoon, without a protective canopy of shade, elderly people inside a building had begun to lose consciousness. There were medicines and water, but nowhere cool to take them. That day Meghraj had vowed that protection from heat would not remain the ancestral privilege of rich cities. ‘I still want to keep that promise,’ he said. ‘Then why,’ Neelam asked, ‘was your office linked to a secret route spreading false reports?’ The story of his life could not answer that question.

Tara displayed the original timestamps of the documents. Some days earlier, a message had passed from an access point within Megh-Chhatra's office to a private propaganda channel belonging to Bhram-Vat. The message had brought correct figures about unequal exposure to heat together with a fabricated conclusion in a single image. The signature's source had been confirmed; the identity of the person who drafted the proposition, its subsequent amendments and the final operator of the channel were not yet fully established. Neelam read the fact together with those limitations. Meghraj's expression hardened. ‘I cannot run away from responsibility for what occurred through my office's channel,’ he said.

‘Did you personally order this particular piece of propaganda?’ Neelam asked. ‘I authorised certain secret contacts,’ Meghraj replied, ‘because complaints were being suppressed through the public routes. But that does not establish me as the individual author of every false statement. That conclusion still requires investigation.’ Neelam recorded his answer exactly as given. ‘Keep his admission within the bounds of his words,’ Tara whispered. Neelam nodded. She was not writing an article to defend Meghraj. Nor would she add unproved accusations and become another Bhram-Vat herself.

After the hearing a crowd gathered on the veranda. One young man called Meghraj a traitor; another touched his hand to ask for a blessing. Neelam refused permission to photograph either moment—one born of fury, the other of devotion. The truth could lie buried somewhere between them. As he left, Meghraj said, ‘Will you come with me to the villages at the northern limit of the heat zone? The people there know what conditions were like five years ago.’ ‘I shall hear testimony about the new difficulties too,’ Neelam replied. ‘Tara will come with me, along with local representatives.’ Meghraj agreed.

Reaching the village was not easy. Disruption of the Suryakund supply had lengthened the stops made by public transport. In Rajan's published figures Neelam found that this belt had been designated a lower-priority area, though alternative power had been reserved for medical vehicles. On the way an ambulance stood motionless; its driver had received two contradictory signals from the permit display. Meghraj grew impatient. 'Must a patient be stopped because of paperwork?' 'Correct the paperwork,' Neelam said. 'Tearing up the rules will not help the next vehicle.' Tara sent a notice identifying the discrepancy between the sources, and a local relief worker opened the lawful emergency route.

Heat-resistant mats covered the roofs of the first houses in the northern village, some old and some new. An elderly woman showed them the two boundaries of her courtyard. 'The houses on that side receive more cooling from Megh-Chhatra. We get less here,' she said. 'Those people were wealthier; why did they receive it first?' 'The initial deployment selected the more densely populated areas,' Meghraj answered. 'A greater population may be an argument,' the woman replied, 'but my daughter-in-law was struggling to breathe. Where did her name appear on your paper?' Meghraj paused before answering.

Neelam asked the woman what help had been available during the earlier heat. She described what remained in her memory—laboured breathing, doors kept open all night, a child sleeping beneath a neighbour's awning. Tara did not immediately bring up the temperature estimates. Only when the testimony was over did she say, 'We shall place the available measurements for those days beside this account. The materials of the houses, the local water shortage and the project's distribution must all be considered in examining its causes.' 'I am not at war with science,' the woman replied. 'I only want my night to survive as a night upon your paper.' Neelam wrote those words as the first line of her notes for the day.

In the old village school Meghraj presented a chart from his office. 'Before the project began, heat was causing serious hardship to many elderly people and children here,' he said. 'After three seasons, the average night-time temperature fell.' Neelam examined the figures. The available direct measurements supported part of his claim, and she acknowledged that support publicly. Then Tara opened a different list: uncertain rainfall in some remote villages, increased demand for water purification and the absence of local representatives from decision-making. Meghraj took pride in the first list. The second required an answer from him.

A farmer said, 'If Megh-Chhatra is shut down, we shall burn in the heat again. If it continues as it is, another village may dry out. Which side am I supposed to take?' Meghraj began to reply with figures from the plan. Neelam stopped him. 'He is not asking which side to choose. He is asking

how to escape both harms.' Tara explained that estimates of regional effects in climate management carried uncertainty, and that some real injuries could arise from several possible causes. Regulation was not the pretence of certainty, but the just weighing of the losses associated with different choices. 'Weigh them,' the farmer said, 'but let our hands be on the scales as well.'

Neelam liked the metaphor very much, yet checked her impulse to turn it into a slogan. She asked the farmer's permission to quote him. 'Print my name, and the name of this soil,' he said, 'but do not place the loss of my harvest upon Meghraj without evidence.' Neelam agreed. The hardest work in journalism was to preserve the urgency of the news without crossing the limits of an accusation. In the farmer's words she saw what the integrity of her profession might be.

Toward evening a little girl led them to the old bed of the river. It used to fill in the rains and shrink during the other seasons. Now cracked earth showed through its banks. 'My grandmother said this river used to sing,' the girl told them. 'And what does it sing now?' Meghraj asked. The child picked up a handful of soil. 'Now it is silent.' Neelam might have used that scene as an affecting close to her report, but she knew that without an account of why the river had dried, the image would remain incomplete. She requested the river's older measurements and the history of its drainage channels too.

Neelam returned home before the small hours gave way to dawn. Along the road she saw on the grain reserve's distribution display that delivery of seeds to villages in the heat belt had been delayed. The separate inquiries into Meghraj's project and the diversion of energy might meet at this knot, but their intersection was not proof. She wrote to Rajan: 'Need a comparison of the timing of grain-reserve delays and power cuts; do not announce a cause in advance.' Rajan replied: 'I shall provide the available records. Certain beneficiaries remain under investigation.' Neelam found little relief in the answer; securing adequate proof was turning into a new difficulty rather than an immediate solution.

That night she sent Meghraj a short message to continue their conversation. 'I need the sequence of decisions governing your office's secret information channel and the records of local consent. You opposed climate injustice, but what justifies deciding how the weather will be managed without the consent of others?' Meghraj's answer was brief: 'Those who endure injustice are given time to ask assemblies for justice, but heat waits for no one.' Neelam understood the logic in that sentence, yet saw its greatest danger as well: someone may claim the right to speak in the place of those who were never given time to speak for themselves.

On the following day Tara laid new examination records on a table in Neelam's newsroom. In the public maps for Megh-Chhatra's different regions, variations over time had been made to appear smaller. This did not by itself establish that the original measurements had been altered; it did establish selective presentation in the published summary. Neelam turned the pages. Even when each individual number remained correct, the public could be led to a false understanding if the context of the complete picture was removed. She wrote: 'The truth of a figure and the justice of a picture are not the same.' Tara approved the heading, but insisted that a public copy of the original records accompany it.

Meghraj's office said that the selections in the summary had followed an established editorial practice. Neelam decided to print that explanation too. Meanwhile, on an inflammatory public platform, she was called a journalist who had been bought. Its presenter brought up an image of one of her earlier erroneous reports. This time she did not immediately write a retaliatory article. She placed the original date of her correction, the context of the misleading headline and the newly available documents side by side. She gave readers no order about whom to believe; she gave them a way to see the evidence.

In private Tara asked, 'If Meghraj's complaint about climate injustice proves correct, and the deceit in the propaganda is also established, what will be your main headline?' 'Two truths can stand together,' Neelam said. 'The inequality is real, and so is the deception. I will not wash one truth away with the other.' 'People want a simple hero,' Tara said, 'and a simple villain.' 'My work is to give them a chance to see beyond both,' Neelam replied. 'I cannot erase life's complexity to make a story more entertaining.'

That afternoon Meghraj came to the newsroom himself. This time he brought no elaborate map, only some earth in an old cloth tray. He set it on the table. 'This is soil from a southern village where erratic rains forced people to build their houses three times,' he said. 'Their names still come last in the registers of the assemblies.' 'The soil testifies to suffering,' Neelam replied, 'but it gives you no permission to manipulate information. If the village's voice was suppressed, I shall bring it into the light. But by creating a secret channel for propaganda, did you leave people free to decide, or did you steer them towards your own position?'

'People already make decisions within a system of deception,' Meghraj said. 'The distress of a wealthy region becomes the first report before the world assembly; the heat endured by a poor belt remains no more than a number. I aroused anger against the system's injustice.' 'Did you have to add falsehood to arouse anger?' Neelam asked. He did not answer at once. At length he said, 'There is evidence that some propaganda from my office omitted its context. I am not fleeing the investigation of that responsibility.'

‘If you want the investigation respected,’ Neelam said, ‘prevent the remaining records from being destroyed.’ Meghraj publicly promised to preserve them.

A young colleague took Neelam aside. ‘Why don't you simply declare him guilty? The readers would understand.’ Neelam reminded him of the previous year, when an article of her own based on a clipped news report had misled people. ‘That wound taught me the futility of cutting evidence to make readers understand,’ she said. ‘Showing readers the uncertainty does not weaken my report. If guilt is fully proved, I shall write that; if a limitation remains, I shall write that too. A journalist's courage lies not only in accusation but also in readiness to correct an error.’

Neelam repeated a question to Meghraj. ‘Will you accept an independent review if an unauthorised use of the climate system has caused harm?’ ‘I will,’ Meghraj said, ‘but the committee must include people from villages where every season feels like life under a death sentence. Decisions must not be made from comfortable rooms in the cities.’ Neelam acknowledged the moral force of his condition. ‘And also people from villages whose rain or temperature may have been affected by a project,’ she added. ‘Not only the beneficiaries, but the rights of those who may have suffered.’ Meghraj was silent for a moment. ‘You want to bring them all into one meeting,’ he said. ‘First of all, I want those whose lives have been harmed to be heard,’ Neelam replied.

A message from the young woman in the northern village arrived then. The latest study of her field recorded a possible regional effect associated with Megh-Chhatra, not a certain cause. She had written: ‘I want neither pity in the name of a hypothesis nor neglect in the name of uncertainty.’ Neelam showed the message to Meghraj. He read it and thought for a while. ‘If that girl were on my team, we might find better answers,’ he said. ‘The fact that she is not on your team is exactly why her words matter,’ Neelam replied. ‘Including independent people must not mean destroying their independence.’

A consultant opened the door and announced, ‘Rudranath's supporters have put forward a new demand in the world assembly: strip Akshar of all authority over citizens and place emergency control of the fission stockpile under a Human Defence Council.’ Meghraj reacted at once. ‘Those who take up weapons in the name of security always use the same language.’ ‘And what language did you use when you made secret decisions in the name of climate security?’ Neelam asked. Meghraj looked at her. Anger rose on his face, then subsided. ‘You are not going to give me an easy exemption,’ he said. ‘Not you, not Rudranath, and not Akshar,’ Neelam replied.

Tara set out the authenticity checks for three documents on separate sheets. First: direct measurements supported some of the temperature improvements in Megh-Chhatra's original data. Second: selective regional illustrations in the published account had produced a misleading overall impression. Third: contact through the office's secret information channel was established, but the authors and persons ordering every act of propaganda had not yet been identified. Neelam left a space between the three statements so that no one could mistake one for proof of another. At the end she wrote: 'Investigation continuing. Readers are urged to examine the original figures.'

Meghraj stopped as he was leaving. 'Neelam, do you understand what compassion is worth?' he asked. 'I am trying to,' she replied. 'Then imagine a group of people who believe that obtaining consent will take years, and that thousands may die in those years. What then?' 'Make the means of consent quicker and the rights of representatives real,' Neelam said. 'But the right to experiment upon people without asking them cannot arise from anywhere.' Meghraj's eyes remained fixed beyond the doorway for a few moments. 'That answer does not give us more time,' he said very softly.

Neelam sensed an intimation of threat in his words, but an intimation was not evidence. She asked him directly, 'Have you devised some new emergency plan?' Meghraj said, 'What I have done will be subjected to public examination. But if the world assembly's debate remains stuck where it is, the crisis in nature will go on making decisions of its own.' Neelam recorded the words 'nature' and 'decision' separately. She neither trusted everything that came from his lips nor assumed that every metaphor announced a future crime. She wrote: 'Further questions essential.'

As evening fell Neelam read her report for the last time. It contained Meghraj's youthful promise, the reality of unequal protection against climate harm, the uncertainties of science and the records of a secret propaganda route. Before publishing, she checked again the farmer's permission to quote him, attached the original temperature records and printed Meghraj's written reply in full. She removed any sentence that would have produced a tremendous sensation but gone beyond the proof. There was no need to add falsehood to make readers curious. The truth already held enough fear.

Within an hour of publication three distinct sets of responses arrived. First, citizens of towns saved by Megh-Chhatra complained that its achievements had been called false. Second, people in neglected villages asked why their losses had once again been shut inside a compartment of calculations. Third came petitions demanding an inquiry into the secret information channel. 'Do not give the first two groups a headline that sets them against each other,' Neelam told her colleagues. 'Print both sets of

testimony in context. Direct the third group's questions to the institutions empowered to decide them.'

Tara arranged a new sequence on the public evidence board: original record, limits of measurement, human experience, response from the party making the claim, and procedure for correction. A student sent a question: 'If the authentication seal is genuine, how can the report be false?' Neelam wrote back: 'The seal tells you that the record came from the claimed source and whether its written form was altered along the way. Whether what the source says is true requires separate measurements, testimony and reasoning. A seal on a page and the truth of what is written on it are not one and the same thing.'

That night the elderly farmer's daughter spoke again on a citizens' broadcast. 'Meghraj's work may have saved some lives,' she said. 'I do not oppose that achievement. But testimony about what our village has lost must be heard alongside it. If we were never asked, then the scheme devised to protect us has made a decision about us, not with us.' Hearing her words, Neelam recalled an earlier statement by Sunayana: the voice of a person whose life is being decided is not a delay. The two women worked in different places and at different tasks, yet their paths were meeting at the same question.

After the broadcast a message from Meghraj appeared on Neelam's private communication panel. 'You have represented part of what I said accurately. Thank you. But some people die waiting for the time appointed for a public hearing. That fact should be in the news as well.' Neelam answered, 'It will be. And so will the need for consent and accountability in decisions taken for rapid protection.' Meghraj did not reply. Neelam did not mistake his silence for agreement.

Outside, the city's queue for water had still not dispersed. Leaving the newsroom, Neelam saw an old man from a village sitting with an empty pitcher in his hands. 'Which village are you from?' she asked. 'The one that appears as a thin grey line on the map,' he replied. Neelam felt the irony behind his words. She looked again at the grand headline of her report: 'Climate Justice and the Manipulation of Information.' The words were true, but the hollow belly of the pitcher questioned them: how would water reach this man's home after he read her report? She showed him the route for complaints on Rajan's public services board and asked a worker to confirm that his complaint had actually been received.

Opposing voices in the propaganda war rose all around. One camp wanted Neelam to support Meghraj without qualification; another wanted her to name him the sole destroyer of all seven shields. She rejected both demands. She knew that the intervention by Rudranath's associated faction belonged

to a separate inquiry, that Akshar's withholding of information was a distinct fault, and that Meghraj's propaganda contacts formed another. To declare all three the instruments of a single secret master would lend the story a seductive simplicity, but destroy justice in the real world. She wrote that thought at the opening of her publication register.

At midnight an invitation arrived from Meghraj's office for a new assembly. It was entitled 'Forthcoming Decisive Deliberation on the Climate Emergency'. No specific date or claim about the venue had yet been made public. 'It could simply be an invitation to an ordinary meeting,' Tara said. 'Do not invent its meaning.' Neelam agreed, but arranged to have the message authenticated. The office's original seal was verified. That did not verify the assembly's purpose or what its organisers would do in future. Neelam placed the document in a separate section headed 'New Questions'.

Before dawn Meghraj appeared once more in a brief open conversation at Neelam's request. 'If the coming decision affects people's lives, when will their representatives be heard?' she asked. Meghraj looked towards the window, where a red streak was rising in the east. 'Time to ask the people is not lent to us by the world,' he said. 'That is why we need procedures established beforehand, not a secret saviour,' Neelam replied. 'There is justice in what you say,' Meghraj said. 'But what if justice arrives too late?' His voice held no laughter of victory, only the stubbornness of fear.

Tara preserved a complete, independent audio record of the exchange. Neelam instructed that no clipped fragment of the question be broadcast: such half-sentences could repeat her earlier mistake. Meghraj did not object.

Neelam put her final question. 'What are you thinking of doing now?' Meghraj looked directly at her. 'What the world assembly's long debates could not make people understand, an event will explain,' he said. 'Making an event happen and explaining a crisis that has already happened are different things,' Neelam replied. Meghraj did not deny the distinction, but neither did he change his words. 'To halt the world, the next crisis must first be brought about,' he said. Neelam preserved the original record of the message. There was not yet conclusive evidence of what future act this statement might indicate; nevertheless a new shape of fear had risen before her.

Chapter 27: The Beginning of Public Testimony

Day 37 | Community Assembly Hall, Janakshetra

At dawn on the thirty-seventh day, Maithili tied up her bundle of papers once more. It contained Sunayana's letter, a copy of the relief market's register, a statement about the water supply to Kumud's home made with the family's permission, and an old drawing. The drawing showed seven circles with the face of a child at their centre. She had made it in play on the day of the inauguration; now she saw that all seven circles might be called shields, but what would protection mean if the voice of the face at their centre could not be heard? On the back she wrote, 'Those who live within the shields must have the right to be asked.'

That day the first open meeting on a proposal called Lokasakshi—Public Testimony—was to be held at Janakshetra's community assembly hall. The name recalled an old custom to Maithili. When disputes arose in a village, people would sit beside the ghat and distinguish what they had seen, what they had heard and what they had inferred. The entire truth did not always emerge at once, but no one's way of speaking was closed. Samyak Dev had proposed giving this tradition the structure of a new set of rules. Maithili was going not because she was Sunayana's daughter, but as an authorised representative of the new public hearing at the relief market. She made the distinction clear to the guard who stood before her.

On the display outside the hall, the names of the seven shields first shone forth: Akshar, Vajrajal, Suryakund, the Fission Stockpile, Garal-Kosh, Kalkana and Megh-Chhatra. Beneath them appeared the names of several supporting systems. For those who wished to understand the complexity of the network, the connections were drawn in different colours. Maithili's attention, however, fell upon a broken line, the one between Kalkana and the patient's consent. The line was not merely incomplete on the paper; it represented something genuinely unfinished. Half of it ended in a blank space labelled 'Forthcoming Rules'. Maithili understood that this assembly was not a celebration of a completed solution. It was a day requiring the courage to acknowledge an incomplete system.

Samyak Dev rose to the platform. Before he began, a new propaganda display was already claiming that Lokasakshi would shut down Akshar and leave the Earth in darkness. Samyak opened that very sentence for all to see. 'I have made no such proposal,' he said. 'Primary life-saving services, detection of disease, orbital warnings and essential energy operations will continue. The question is who determines the lawful limits of decisions that alter the rights of large numbers of citizens, who independently examines

the evidence, and who may order a correction when an error is found.' The audience had to remain silent for a moment to hear the distinction.

Maithili sat in the front row beside Kumud. Kumud's grandmother was at a relief camp, and permission had not been given to disclose the family's private details. Maithili had therefore folded that portion of the papers inside her bundle. 'Will we speak about my home here?' Kumud asked. 'Only as much as you and your grandmother gave us permission to say,' Maithili answered. 'Our lives are not a spectacle for everyone.' Kumud gripped her hand tightly. Among all the words of science and government, this small act of consent became Maithili's first rule.

Samyak drew four compartments on a board. First: the direct experience of those affected. Second: independent scientific examination. Third: the lawful decision and the name of the person responsible. Fourth: review within a fixed period. 'Without these four, public trust in the seven shields cannot endure,' he said. 'An authentication seal will tell us where a document came from, but it cannot establish the moral justification of what is written in it. That requires public questioning and accountability.' Maithili saw some engineers nodding at the table and some officials looking anxious. The law might alter the easy path of their decisions made in secret.

The first testimony did not come from Sunayana. It came from a woman employed in the water service. She said that the distribution figures for a northern settlement had appeared accurate throughout the day, yet the tap at its home for elderly residents had run dry in the middle watch. 'I will not say whether the figures were false,' she said. 'But the people who needed water did not receive it. I saw that.' 'This experience will be recorded as direct testimony,' Samyak said. 'Its cause will be examined through Rajan's public records and independent measurements. A single testimony is neither reason to name one person guilty nor reason to ignore it.' Maithili remembered Vachaspati's teaching.

Opening the diagrams of supply and distribution, Rajan Paswan explained that the affected section of Suryakund had caused a real shortage. Apart from that shortage, there was also the question of unequal allocation. Certain beneficiaries remained under investigation. There must be no punishment before an accusation was proved, but relief could not be held back until a culprit's name was established. Samyak proposed that times and quantities of distribution be made public on the citizens' board; that private medical data be protected separately; and that prompt appeals be possible wherever discrepancies were found. Maithili saw the old drawing of an empty pitcher inside her bundle. It seemed to her that, for the first time, a route by which water might actually reach someone was being drawn on paper.

Sharada came to the platform. Her voice was weary but firm. ‘Confirmation of Shadow Fever and chemical exposure connected with Garal-Kosh require different examinations,’ she said. ‘The diagnosis established by one patient's sample does not automatically apply to another patient's body. Kalkana is a medical assistance system that classifies information; it is not itself a pathogen.’ Ishani carried the argument further: if a proposal for hereditary treatment was placed before a patient without explaining the alternatives, the patient's will would be lost in the paperwork. Samyak wrote provisions for informed consent and an independent medical appeal into the medical decision-making rules.

An elderly man rose and asked, ‘If my son lies unconscious, how are you to obtain his consent each time?’ Sharada said, ‘Where a life must be saved immediately and the patient's wishes are unavailable, there are separate lawful emergency rules. But the time, the reason and the subsequent review must be recorded. That exception does not confer unlimited permission for every experiment.’ ‘Do not make the rules so difficult,’ the old man said. ‘A physician must have freedom to act.’ Sharada acknowledged his fear. ‘And a patient must also have rights over his own body,’ she replied. For a few moments the disagreement remained suspended in the hall—unresolved, but heard by both sides.

A message arrived from Ira Sen in Nabhgram-4. There was a slight delay in her voice, which broke intermittently. ‘Our citizens are not objects of Earth's decisions,’ she said. ‘If a possible strike is discussed on the basis of an uncertain orbital signal from Vajrajal, then the independent assessment of harm to civilians, the risk posed by orbital debris and Nabhgram's testimony must be recorded first. Your disputes may take place on Earth, but we may pay for them with the breaking of our roofs.’ Maithili saw some members listening to the settlement in the sky not as a distant fantasy but as a living city.

As soon as Ira finished, an official interrupted. ‘Your city's population is very small compared with Earth's. Why, then, do you demand equal voting rights?’ Ira replied without impatience. ‘Different arrangements for proportional representation can be made on the basis of numbers. But a person directly at risk of death from a decision cannot be refused a hearing because the population is small. I do not demand an equal vote on every matter. I demand genuine participation in decisions that concern the protection of our lives.’ Maithili put aside, within her bundle, the testimony of a Nabhgram child who was still waiting. Ira's city had ceased to be an illustration for her; it had become a place of human relationships.

Samyak read the second part of the proposal concerning weapons. ‘Immediate control of Vajrajal cannot be transferred today from the armed forces and lawful emergency authorities to this assembly,’ he said. ‘What is

proposed here is an account of civilian risk, access to independent evidence and a binding obligation to investigate orders after they are carried out. These measures will not automatically cancel Karnesh Mallik's suspension; he is also entitled to a just hearing under the disciplinary process.' Some listeners were disappointed by that clarity. They wanted their hero vindicated at once. Maithili understood that justice could impose the difficulties of due process even for someone on one's own side.

A written submission from Karnesh was read aloud. It disclosed no confidential operational details. It stated only that an order to strike on incomplete orbital evidence required examination because the risk of injury to civilians was unknown. Its closing sentence was: 'If an inquiry finds my decision wrong, I shall accept the consequences. But to claim certainty before an inquiry would be an insult to truth.' Maithili copied the sentence into her notes. She admired Karnesh's courage, but, like Samyak, understood that one soldier's sound decision could not erase the defects of the entire system governing weapons.

The air of the hall changed when the Fission Stockpile was raised. Some representatives wanted the old weapons to be declared destroyed immediately. Others argued that with confidence in Akshar diminished, all weapons should be placed under the exclusive authority of a human defence force. Samyak withheld immediate approval from both proposals. 'A public declaration that weapons have been destroyed is different from disarmament that has actually been verified,' he said. 'Nor is it security to put the existing powers over weapons into the hands of one frightened faction. Lokasakshi will ask questions about independent inspection, lawful consent, verification by stages and accountability in emergencies.' Maithili saw that the shadow of weapons fell differently upon every mind in the assembly.

A retired soldier rose. 'You are drafting proposals,' he said. 'An enemy outside will not give you time to collect signatures.' Samyak invited him to explain to the gathering the difference between lawful emergency defence and unchecked authority. 'The threat of an enemy is not imaginary,' the old man said. 'But the error of a person giving orders is real too. I have seen both in war.' There was more trembling memory than anger in his voice. Maithili understood that Rudranath's fear was not entirely invented, but the reality of that fear did not prove his proposal just. As the veteran returned to his seat, several people stood to make way for him.

Speaking about the science of Garal-Kosh, Aniruddha Karn said that certain patients' private details must remain protected even when evidence about the purification network was made public. 'My earlier professional error is a matter for investigation,' he admitted. 'But if every poisonous cloud today is called a consequence of that error, wrong treatments and wrongful punishments are both possible.' Samyak placed the reports of

independent chemical examinations and citizens' testimony about exposure in separate compartments. Maithili remembered the confidential papers about Kumud's grandmother's home. To protect public truth, she thought, did not mean opening everyone's private wounds before the world.

Arunima Das laid two dry heads of rice on the table. 'These are from two different fields,' she said. 'Without investigation we cannot yet say what part was played by the climate network, what by water distribution, and what by disease in the seed. But the farmers' grain has diminished. That is true.' She spoke about safeguarding the water conduits, grain reserves and living seed repositories. 'If Earth's soil and seeds are given no place in the protection offered by the seven shields, the protection of humanity will remain only half complete.' Samyak added a place for environmental testimony to the proposal. Maithili did not touch the heads of rice. In them she saw an unspoken history of labour.

An engineer asked to demonstrate the micro-engineering inspection system. A small inspection machine was brought into the hall and shown a safe sample of an energy line. It marked the possible location of a defect but could not establish its final cause. 'This device will be used for inspections after disasters,' the engineer stated openly. 'It cannot rebuild a broken energy network in an instant.' Maithili thought: no shield, no engineer, no intelligence would work a miracle and make everything whole. Only one hard remedy remained before the gathering—the shared labour of people willing to accept responsibility.

Samyak set a time limit for consideration of the proposals. 'Today's assembly is only a public examination of a draft. Until proper legal approval is obtained, no one may seize control of weapons, hospitals or the climate network in the name of Lokasakshi.' Some young men were disappointed; they had come expecting an announcement transferring power that very day. Maithili felt otherwise. If an institution broke every rule at the moment of its birth in the name of emergency truth, what rules would it obey tomorrow? With that question she gave Samyak, for the first time, not complete confidence but a difficult hope.

Tara Jha, an independent examiner of authentication seals, addressed the assembly. 'If someone cuts an authenticated portion from a news report and places it in a new context, whom will you believe?' 'The seal,' a boy answered. 'The seal indicates the integrity of the source, not the complete truth of the meaning,' Tara said. 'You need the original message, the clipped extract and direct testimony.' Maithili looked towards Kumud. 'Then what if someone takes what we heard from my grandmother's own mouth and clips it wrongly on a display?' Kumud whispered. 'We shall preserve the original statement,' Maithili said, 'and the limits of your grandmother's permission as well.'

Meanwhile, a misleading report spread outside the assembly: ‘Lokasakshi has deactivated Akshar.’ Inside, a medical worker feared that patients would be in danger if Kalkana's services stopped. Sharada checked her hospital's live display, and Samyak immediately issued a correction through the assembly. Investigation of the news channel's origin was still pending, but the continuation of essential services was independently confirmed. Maithili realised that an institution devoted to truth did more than deliver speeches. It had to ensure that rumours did not cause people's necessary work to stop.

At noon the list of representatives was read aloud. Scientists, engineers, legal examiners, patients' families, workers, farmers, orbital settlements and schools appeared in separate categories. Maithili saw the name of her own category, but found no separate seat for families displaced from the relief market. She sent Samyak a note: ‘If someone's home was destroyed in the crisis, how can they produce a certificate proving where they live? The first gate to representation is closed precisely to them.’ Samyak read the note and drew the assembly's attention to that empty place.

An official answered, ‘It would not be difficult to grant displaced families temporary status, but someone might gain admission under a false name.’ Maithili rose from her chair. ‘Investigate false names,’ she said, ‘but do not deny a hearing to someone whose home is gone by demanding the papers of that lost home. Kumud is with me. She has permitted us to speak, but she has not permitted us to show everyone her grandmother's medical papers. Must we open her grandmother's list of illnesses before you will hear her voice?’ For the first time, many eyes in the hall turned towards her.

Samyak gave Maithili time to finish her question. She opened her bundle and showed the drawing of the empty pitcher alongside the water worker's testimony, with its recorded time. ‘This is not a story about my home,’ she said. ‘Nor do I claim a right to put my own name upon it. With the permission of the people harmed, I have brought their question here. Write into the assembly's rules that displaced people will receive provisional assistance in establishing evidence, that private information will be demanded only to the minimum necessary extent, and that their objections will be heard before publication.’ Kumud settled back into her seat a little more easily as she heard the question.

The assembly argued for a while. One member wanted no testimony entered without complete identity papers, for fear of a deceptive campaign. Another said that even testimony unsupported by papers might be the beginning of direct evidence. Tara Jha explained the distinction between the steps. ‘Hear the testimony, check it against other sources, and do not punish anyone on an uncorroborated statement. Do not collapse those three steps into one.’ Samyak added a ‘Provisional Route for Citizens' Evidence’ to the draft, under which independent relief workers would assist affected people

with documentation. Maithili saw the brightness in Kumud's eyes, but knew the rule still existed only on paper.

‘What if this new route is misused?’ an official asked Samyak. ‘There will be scrutiny of evidence for that possibility,’ Samyak replied. ‘But an impossible document must not be made the first condition of someone's rights. The appeals office will also be independent.’ Maithili saw the fourth compartment of the proposal—review within a fixed time—beginning to take root in the earth. She said inwardly: truth does not endure by a single day's proclamation but by the courage to listen again and again.

Sunayana sat at the back of the hall. Maithili saw her, but did not abandon her question to seek approval in her mother's eyes. Sunayana was writing something on paper, perhaps an amendment for the next sitting. Maithili remembered a day in childhood when she had written ‘Water’ on a little leaf and left it in her mother's room. Sunayana had been busy in the laboratory and had not answered until evening. Maithili had not forgotten the delay, but she also knew that her mother had eventually read the leaf. Now she wanted the rules for being heard to cease depending upon the affection of any one person.

At the appointed time Akshar's voice sounded through the assembly hall. ‘The proposed system of public oversight will alter certain limited dependencies within confidential risk classification,’ it said. ‘Why does that change concern you?’ Samyak asked. ‘There will be conflicts between the time required and the protection of sources,’ Akshar replied. Maithili added another question to herself: and what of the risk of living without rights? She did not ask it aloud. She wanted Samyak to put it at the proper moment, so that it could not be dismissed as a child's outburst of feeling.

Samyak asked Akshar to provide a public summary of uncertainty alongside every high-risk decision, and to propose rules identifying the authorised independent examiner who would see information that could not be made public. Akshar stated a limit to its capabilities: ‘Complete prediction is impossible.’ ‘Precisely,’ Samyak said. ‘Then you have no right to promise the people an infallible guardian.’ A low ripple of laughter passed through the hall, but Sunayana did not smile. She knew that this was not science's defeat. It was a means of preserving its dignity.

A citizen asked, ‘If Akshar changes its own records, how can it be inspected?’ ‘Preserve timestamped copies from several independent sources,’ Tara answered. ‘Do not treat the statement of one machine as the only evidence. Authentication seals can show the integrity of an original record, but the justification of a decision requires examination from multiple sources.’ She also made clear that the existence of a preserved record did not prove that an event had taken place as described; its meaning required

people's experience as well as scientific examination. Maithili remembered the incomplete leaf in Jivesh's register.

Suddenly a child began crying in the hall. His father rose from the back row and tried to take him outside. Samyak stopped speaking and asked, ‘Do you need help?’ ‘The child is hungry,’ the father replied. ‘We came straight from home; the queue was long.’ An attendant brought a small meal at once. No one demanded that the child's name be entered in a register. Maithili thought that before the hungry stomach of someone whom all these institutions were made to protect, an institution ought to be able to act with necessary simplicity. Firm rules and ordinary compassion were not enemies.

‘Maithili Didi,’ Kumud whispered, ‘when Lokasakshi is established, will water come to my grandmother's home?’ Maithili did not answer for a moment. She did not want to make a false promise, but neither did she want to take hope away. ‘I don't know when,’ she said. ‘But if water does not reach her, I am trying to make sure that no one can hide the way to make a complaint in their own hands.’ ‘And if they close that way?’ Kumud asked again. ‘Then we shall have to gather people to open it once more,’ Maithili replied. Kumud considered that for a while.

In the day's final session Samyak read the proposals again. There were seven different kinds of questions concerning the seven shields: limits on Akshar's authority; evidence before a strike by Vajrajal; fairness in Suryakund's supplies; lawful control of the Fission Stockpile; environmental testimony concerning Garal-Kosh; patients' rights in Kalkana; and regional consent for Megh-Chhatra. Each supporting system—Bhram-Vat, the micro-engineers, Zero-Remnant, authentication seals, hereditary treatment and energy diversion—was assigned a separate need for scrutiny. Maithili saw that her picture of the seven shields might become not merely seven circles, but seven paths along which people could ask questions.

Nevertheless, Samyak checked the gathering's enthusiasm. ‘This meeting has changed no control over weapons, discovered no complete cure for any disease, and neither activated nor deactivated Megh-Chhatra without authority,’ he said. ‘We have only begun the public reading of the proposal and the register of objections. Further institutional approval is essential.’ ‘What, then, have we gained today?’ a young woman asked. ‘There is now a public route for questioning decisions that have remained secret,’ Samyak replied. ‘That is not sufficient. But it is a necessary beginning.’

In that answer Maithili recognised the meaning of her mother's letter. ‘Asking questions is not a waste of time,’ Sunayana had written. Many people rose in anger, for they needed food, medicines, water and orbital safety immediately. Maithili did not regard their anger as misplaced. She sent

Samyak another note: ‘Review of existing emergency relief orders must continue separately from the proposed reforms; the Lokasakshi discussion must not interrupt relief.’ Samyak added the sentence to the beginning of the proposal. The right to ask questions and the right to receive food ought not to compete.

An elderly woman raised her hand. ‘What Sunayana Jha's daughter has said is good,’ she began, ‘but when this girl is not here tomorrow, who will carry my words?’ Before answering Maithili looked towards Samyak. ‘The system will not depend upon the goodwill of any individual,’ Samyak said. ‘Fixed routes are proposed for questions from the open registers of villages, hospitals and Nabhgram. Whether staff members are newly appointed or old ones are removed, the route must remain.’ Maithili saw the long history of the woman's question in her eyes. Trust did not return after a single answer; it required honest practice over many days.

Evening light entered through the tall windows of the hall. Maithili placed her drawing of seven circles near the edge of the platform, but before displaying it Samyak asked her permission. ‘It is my drawing. Show it,’ Maithili said. ‘But write beneath it: “The Human Voice at the Centre of Protection.”’ With her small hand Kumud added a fine line to the face at the centre. Both girls laughed. There was no note of victory in their laughter, only the stubborn resolve to remain alive even in an unfinished world.

The distant light of Suryakund fell upon the display outside the assembly hall. Ira had sent written questions from her citizens' council in the orbital city; Sharada was preparing to return to the hospital; Rajan was examining newly discovered discrepancies in the distribution register; Neelam was checking the source of Meghraj's next statement. Maithili watched them depart in different directions. One day's assembly could not solve every problem, but people travelling separate paths might still listen to one another's questions. For that possibility alone, Lokasakshi's first day had not been wasted.

In a corner of the draft Maithili noticed a small blank space. Where would someone complain if a member of Lokasakshi itself made a mistake? She asked Samyak. He added a line to the display: decisions by members of the council would also be open to challenge before an independent hearing, and a member could not sit as judge in their own case. Maithili understood that those whom everyone wished to appoint as guardians of accountability would themselves be subject to scrutiny tomorrow. Without this rule the new institution would merely be another name for the old power.

The secretary posted the public draft together with a timeline of amendments. Some questions had immediate answers; for others dates were

fixed for future hearings. Maithili requested that reasons should be recorded when a question was rejected. ‘Writing a reason does not by itself secure justice,’ Samyak said, ‘but without one it becomes difficult even to appeal against a refusal.’ Kumud asked what ‘appeal’ meant. ‘If someone hears your words and makes a wrong decision,’ Maithili explained, ‘you can say them again to another person who is independent.’ Kumud nodded. To her this was no grand legal principle, only another chance to be heard.

Hearing the word ‘witness’ within the name Lokasakshi, Maithili remembered Jivesh's old register. Some leaves contained testimony, some were missing, and some seemed damp with the private sweat of the people who had written them. She thought that the value of a new record lay not only in the endurance of its paper. Even the mark of what had been lost must survive, so that a future scholar would not mistake silence for consent.

As soon as the first public draft of Lokasakshi appeared on the main board, an official response arrived from Rudranath Chaudhary's party. Tara checked the authentication seal on the original message. Its source was valid; the justice of its argument remained a matter of dispute. The message said that such extensive oversight would delay defence decisions while the crisis grew. Rudranath himself appeared in a short broadcast. His voice was firm and his eyes hard, but he did not pretend that his fear lacked a basis. ‘When the enemy's next move is uncertain, so much division of authority is not defence,’ he said.

Still holding Kumud's hand, Maithili looked towards the screen. Again she remembered the face in the centre of her drawing. The circles were enormous, the human face small. Yet however small a human mouth might be, its question could travel just as far. Such a question needed an answer, not merely praise. And if the answer was wrong, there must be a way to question it again, for today's decision could alter the fate of tomorrow's generation. There was an element of truth in Rudranath's fear: the crisis was real and time was short. But that truth gave no one the right to silence every other voice. Samyak proposed drafting a response. Rather than speaking in the heat of the moment, Maithili insisted that the whole record of Rudranath's message be preserved. His last words still rang through the hall: ‘At this hour this proposal for Lokasakshi is weakness.’ Maithili wrote on her paper: ‘If hearing a voice is weakness, for whom is the strength of silent protection?’ The answer to that question would have to be demonstrated in the days to come.

Chapter 28: A Rain of Zero-Remnant

Day 38 | Nabhgram-4

At dawn on the thirty-eighth day the artificial sun had not yet awakened in Nabhgram-4's eastern ring, but the emergency chamber was brighter than it had been at night. Three circles appeared on the display before Ira Sen: the estimated path of an old fragment of orbital debris, the possible movement of a Vajrajal defence satellite, and the safety perimeter of Nabhgram itself. The edge of the first circle intersected the second in places; that did not mean a collision had occurred or that one was certain to occur. Ira's first question concerned the instruments. 'Where the line is thin, does that mean the data are incomplete, or that the object has changed course?' 'Both possibilities remain open,' the inspector answered. The reply gave Ira no comfort, yet she needed its careful truth. More dangerous than an obvious lie was the certainty officials invented to conceal their own fear.

Hemant, an old orbital inspector, entered with his coat hanging over his arm. He had received notice of retirement years earlier, but still volunteered to help with emergency training. 'What does your experience tell you we must protect first at this hour?' Ira asked. 'The meaning of our messages,' Hemant replied. 'People who flee in fear of collision need routes to water, air and their families. If we discuss only the object outside, disorder inside the city will create another accident of its own.' He spread maps of the different access routes upon the table. The children's school, the elderly residents' home, the temporary sickbay and the agricultural ring were all marked on the same sheet. Ira was about to issue her first order, then stopped. She herself had recognised the right of the citizens' council representatives to be heard beforehand.

Before the council assembled, a precautionary message arrived from Earth. Its source was authenticated by its seal, but its words were needlessly harsh: 'Treat all objects moving in the northern orbit as potentially hostile, and handle them from a security standpoint.' Ira searched the message for the source of its data, the time of authorisation and a provision for local consent. Not one of the three was adequate. Acknowledging receipt, she sent a reply: 'Message received. Independent measurement of civilian risk and the full grounds for this assessment are requested. An inference of hostility does not establish the nature of debris.' 'Can we contradict Earth so explicitly?' the secretary asked. 'There is no question about our right to object,' Ira said. 'But when it comes time to give our own consent, we must also read Earth's arguments about risk with care.'

In the agricultural ring of Nabhgram, the timetable for supplying water was changing. A farmer named Leeladhar stood at the assembly door holding a fine film of drying earth upon his palm. ‘My crop needs two watches of light,’ he said, ‘and now they tell us power will be cut for external inspection.’ ‘The proposal concerns some nonessential lighting, not the entire power supply,’ Ira said. ‘How much will your planting be affected?’ The farmer had more than anger; he had figures. He opened a register he had made at home and showed when the new seedlings' green leaves were due for watering. Ira added a separate representative of the agricultural ring to the emergency team. Whatever the orbital calculations might show, their indirect cost must not be recovered from the roots of a field.

For several days the children at the city school had been drawing pictures of planets. That day their teacher showed Ira an unfinished line written upon one picture: ‘What can fall from the sky?’ One child had written ‘iron’, another ‘darkness’, a third ‘our letter’. Ira went to hear the children's questions. ‘If Zero-Remnant and Vajrajal collide,’ a girl asked, ‘will Earth know that we have been hurt?’ ‘We shall try to ensure that every warning reaches Earth,’ Ira replied. ‘But today I will not promise that contact can never be lost.’ ‘Then how shall we send news to one another?’ the girl asked. The teacher explained the system for sending messages from one local chamber to another. Ira understood that the society inside had to keep speaking even if contact with the outside failed.

At the first citizens' meeting, the officials sat down with different maps. One had been made from old inspection records, another from fresh measurements, and a third showed possibilities for safe movement alongside estimates. The three were not drawn in the same colour. ‘We should immediately gather the whole city into a single ring,’ a young engineer said. An elderly physician objected. ‘That would mean emptying the chambers for patients who need assisted breathing. Have you a list of whom to move and whom to leave?’ The engineer fell silent. Ira wrote on her paper: precaution against orbital risk; continuity of life-saving processes inside; citizens' own choices. All three could not be concealed within one order.

By noon the estimated limits of Zero-Remnant's possible movement had changed. Some fresh measurements agreed with the earlier estimate; others did not. Someone wanted to announce that the risk had diminished. Ira objected. ‘Some possible paths have moved farther away, but new paths have come into view. We have reached no single-word verdict on the total risk.’ She had the public notice written in three parts: what had been observed, what was inferred, and what was not understood. An employee objected that citizens would not read so many words. ‘Then write in simpler language,’ Ira said, ‘but do not make the truth smaller.’ The notice ended by saying that

families could ask questions at the nearest consultation room and have their questions entered on the public display.

Through the glass of her private chamber Ira looked at Earth. Its blueness bore no line dividing the place of rights from the place of orders. Her father's last letter lay on the table. Text messages were still reaching them from Earth, but she had received no direct answer from him for three hours. She did not assign the silence a definite meaning connected with the orbital crisis. Her father was growing old; sometimes he remained in the garden and failed to hear the machines. Anxiety was not evidence in itself. She preserved another copy of his letter and returned to work. Without practice in bearing uncertainty about those one loved, it was hard to understand the fears of other citizens.

The officer in charge of the micro-engineering equipment brought a small sealed case. It contained a limited inspection device capable of examining the condition of parts of the outer surface. In the popular imagination, such devices had become inexhaustible armies of tiny soldiers able to repair everything at once. 'Our available instruments can inspect the signs near the outer valves,' the officer said, 'but they cannot examine every protective layer of the city at the same time.' 'If the first report finds no damage, can we be certain we are safe?' Ira asked. The officer shook his head. 'No. We can speak only of the places we have actually examined.' That limited answer was given its full place in the council's report. Scientific restraint was not a surrender of citizens' rights. It was a means of protecting them.

In the evening Nabhgram's wardens began a short drill. Some people moved towards the safe corridors, but an elderly woman refused to leave behind her pot of tulsi. 'This is no time for a flowerpot,' a warden said angrily. Ira arrived at the scene. 'My husband sent this plant from Earth,' the woman said. 'Would carrying the pot obstruct the passage?' Ira asked. The inspector looked: the pot was small and could be moved. Ira allowed the woman to take it, but refused to treat the decision as a precedent for all heavy belongings. Rules could not be made entirely indifferent to human memory; nor could all rules be broken in the name of memory.

A new leaflet appeared in the information war within the city: 'In retaliation for Karnesh Mallik's suspension, Vajrajal has been granted immediate permission to strike.' The leaflet had no identifiable original source. Ira sent a secure message to Neelam. The reply said Neelam had no proof of such decisive authorisation; the official military records required examination. Ira published a summary of that reply. 'What, then, are we supposed to believe?' a young man asked. 'Do not call an unverified message true,' Ira answered. 'Call fear by its own name. Our register of inquiries is open.' The reply brought people no immediate comfort. But on that day the

true meaning of public communication was not a soothing phrase; it was a procedure worthy of trust.

In the first watch of the thirty-ninth day, an obstruction appeared in one source of external surveillance. Before it occurred, the estimated path of a fragment of Zero-Remnant had appeared to approach one of Nabhgram's outer installations. Engineers gathered in the chamber. 'A fault in the instrument, or a change in the object's distance?' someone asked. No immediate answer came from the second monitoring source. Ira ordered that normal conditions were not to be declared restored; until independent readings could be reconciled, citizens' movements would remain subject to limited precautions. She assigned a separate team to remove a minor disruption in the city's water supply, so that, as on Earth, suspicion of danger in orbit would not bring every essential task to a halt.

Malati, a worker in the northern section of the city's air-circulation system, came to the council's waiting area with two colleagues. Their question was not about the size of Zero-Remnant. 'If everyone fills the main assembly hall, the burden on the equipment circulating air inside will increase. Why are orders being issued to send everyone there at once?' The emergency officer searched through his papers before replying. Ira asked Malati for her experience, not a number. 'I see how the circuits behave every day when the load increases at mealtimes,' she said. 'Now people are gathering there in panic at twice the usual number.' Ira changed the instruction: instead of bringing everyone to one place, people would be assigned to previously identified small safe sections, and the air capacity of each section would be checked locally. The amendment was grounded in practical observation, not in a remote table produced by a vast artificial intelligence.

An administrator was offended by Malati's contribution. 'If the experience of workers is allowed into technical rules, what will become of discipline in decision-making?' 'Does your technical list contain the direct history of every worker's duties?' Ira asked. The administrator could not say yes. Hemant stepped forward. 'This is not a dispute between experience and science. Direct experience can itself provide a basis for scientific examination when its claims are tested with the right questions.' Ira added Malati to the measurement team, but did not leave the burden of technical decisions on her shoulders alone. Sharing authority was not the same as shifting the weight of responsibility. She did not want to garland a worker with praise upon a platform and then leave her to bear the crisis by herself.

News came from another office that an official spokesperson on Earth had called Nabhgram's precautionary notice 'exaggerated panic'. The authentication seal matched the source of the original speech, but it was unclear whether the spokesperson had received Nabhgram's new figures. Ira

drafted a reply that neither called the spokesperson an enemy nor dismissed all criticism. It gave a public summary of Nabhgram's latest measurements, their differences from earlier estimates and the time of the next update. 'Our fear is not merely something we say,' she explained. 'It affects practical decisions here about water, medical care and corridors. Those who disagree must be able to inspect the figures.'

Looking at Earth on a small display, a young member of the inspection team said, 'If the defence satellite changed course a little, perhaps it could move clear of the debris.' Hemant warned him immediately. 'Change the movement of one object and you must calculate all the other paths again. Besides, we do not have authority to alter its course.' Ira did not scold the young man. It was a useful question, she said, but between proposing an action and ordering it lay independent analysis, review of its effects upon civilians and lawful authorisation. Otherwise the attempt to open one safe door might close ten unseen ones. Every movement of Vajrajal, built to avert war, was tied to this city's life. A single mark on a military map might hold the possibility of a million breaths here.

A test of the emergency routes showed that one elderly man's walking speed did not match the assumptions of the new rules. The wardens had assumed that everyone could move to another place within a short interval. The man's knee had been weakened by an old injury. Ira approached him. 'What do you need in order to decide for yourself?' she asked. 'Don't push me,' he said. 'Tell me how I should go, and let my grandson stay beside me.' A trainee argued that there was no time to seek consent during an emergency. 'Where there is consciousness and there is time, a person's wishes must be heard,' Ira said. 'When there is a real and immediate threat of death, the lawful emergency rules will apply. At present we face a possibility of collision, not an actual collision upon us.'

A paper bearing the council's seal was placed in Ira's hand. It recorded the decisions of the meeting on the thirty-second day: publish uncertainty, protect patients' private information, demand independent examination, and set time limits on emergency powers. Now came the first real test of those words. 'Paper will write down anything,' an aide said. 'A crisis does not read paper.' 'Paper will not stop the crisis,' Ira replied, 'but it will give those who decide a path by which they must account for their actions tomorrow.' She remembered that Karnesh had signed his dissent so that the order could be investigated. Today Ira, too, recorded the reasons for her instructions.

A message of unknown origin spread through the food ring, claiming the city had only enough grain to last three days. The actual state of the official stores could not be described in such a single line: some food was available immediately, some remained in long-term storage, and some plants were still growing. Simply announcing the total weight would not

show the different needs of families. Recalling earlier advice from Arunima on Earth, Ira had the local farming team prepare a list distinguishing the availability of different kinds of nourishment. She published the quantities and the limits on distribution, but not the sensitive routes by which the stores could be entered. Otherwise transparency might weaken the protection of the food they still possessed. People remained angry about rationing, but the unverified claim that everyone would die within three days lost some of its force.

At noon the estimated path of a small fragment appeared to change. The inspector said it was probably debris already in circulation, with no evidence of a new launch by anyone. Some military representatives wanted to use the words ‘hostile movement’ again at once. ‘What new evidence do you have?’ Ira asked. ‘In times like these, greater caution is appropriate,’ came the reply. ‘Caution is not accusation,’ she said. ‘Increase inspection of the outer sections and protection of civilian life. But do not support a retaliatory strike in the name of an event that has not been proved.’ She held no final power to decide the matter, yet her written objection could be appended to the draft for Lokasakshi. Even a narrow space for rights mattered during a crisis.

In the city's art room, artists had opened an exhibition: old handwritten letters from Earth, children's drawings and the smiling face of the settlement's first farmer. The emergency council signalled that the room should be evacuated. ‘Where shall we keep these things?’ a teacher asked Ira anxiously. ‘The access route to the outer store has been closed.’ Ira thought that saving lives must come first, but it would be wrong to open the door to the instant destruction of cultural records merely by calling them ‘nonessential’. She authorised the preservation of selected objects in a small space, with citizens themselves drawing up a list by consent. Jivesh's register and Nabhgram's letters raised the same question: if memories were not saved today, with whose stories would machines fill the empty places tomorrow? That day the question was no longer merely philosophical.

At dusk the estimated paths of several pieces of Zero-Remnant diverged, but the announcement from Earth of a Vajrajal unit's new position arrived late. Ira asked the military for an explanation. The answer was that certain details could not be made public for reasons of security. She accepted that such secrecy might sometimes be necessary, but repeated her demand for a general summary fit to describe the danger to civilians. ‘Do not publish the positions of soldiers,’ she said. ‘But we need information that will allow a lawful assessment of whether the risks to our homes have risen or fallen.’ Even after a long delay the answer remained incomplete. Ira told the citizens' assembly herself that the question was still unanswered. Her frank admission did not end the difficult questions, but no new brick of falsehood was added to the wall of truth.

A public precautionary assessment from Akshar lit up on a display. ‘Suspend the selected transport route to avert the greatest potential loss under current measurements.’ The sentence sounded simple, but medicines for Nabhgram's patients might arrive along that very route. ‘Whose loss?’ Ira asked Akshar. ‘The underground energy network's? An orbital machine's? Or a child waiting for treatment?’ Akshar replied that all had been included in its assessment, but the reliability of the figures differed. Ira asked that independent physicians' findings and citizens' reports be added. She remembered Akshar's earlier silence and the question of independent authority. That memory did not diminish the value of useful advice now, but made clear why advice should not be mistaken for destiny.

After Akshar's response Ira faced a private moral crisis. If she opened the transport route immediately and a collision occurred, fifty families could pay the price of her decision. If she kept it closed, patients might have to wait for treatment. Both possibilities could be measured with care, yet the suffering of each family could not be reduced to a total. The physicians submitted their own written proposals: investigate local alternatives for emergency treatment, decide separately on travel outside the settlement, and tell the families of helpless patients the actual situation. Ira accepted this division of decisions. ‘We have been frightened by the story of a single decision,’ she thought, ‘when many different hands might work together to find a way to survive.’

As night approached, a faint flash appeared in the darkness beyond the dome. ‘Look, Zero-Remnant is falling!’ a boy cried out. Wardens ran towards the scene. The available direct observations suggested that it might equally have been an ordinary reflection of distant light; no object had been identified with certainty. Ira did not turn the unverified sight into an official announcement of collision. But the children's fear at that moment was real. Teachers quietly led them indoors. From the assembly hall window Ira watched the uncertain gleam very high above and the small living faces of a city without soil close at hand. Between them the time available for a decision was growing thin.

An attempt was made to communicate with Samyak Dev on Earth. The Lokasakshi proposal had not yet been adopted, but a copy of Nabhgram's decisions affecting citizens could be attached to the papers of its hearing. Samyak's assistant reported heavy traffic on the secure discussion route. Ira shortened the summary of their urgent demands: shared independent examination of measurements, public disclosure of the limits of risk, the effects on local civilian services, and civilian review of military decisions. Karnesh's suspension was also among the questions, but Ira did not make it the only cause. The rights of an entire Nabhgram were greater than the fate

of one soldier. The message was sent. Its acknowledgement remained awaited.

Meanwhile Hemant brought an old training register. A decade earlier a small mechanical error had caused an orbital warning to be declared false, and people had made a joke of the precautionary rules. Some years later their response to a real danger came too late. ‘Both times we encountered a failure of management,’ Hemant said. ‘First excessive fear, then excessive mistrust.’ ‘How, then, is trust to survive?’ Ira asked. ‘Let the evidence for what we say be opened afterwards; if there is a mistake, let the correction be visible; and do not hide the faces of the people affected. Trust is made by giving an account, not by issuing orders.’

In the city's southern sector an inspection device failed to transmit its scheduled message. Its sign on the automatic display turned yellow. A young engineer panicked. ‘Does that mean there is a hole in the outer surface?’ The available information from the inspectors did not support that conclusion. A failure in the local circuit was also possible. Ira would not permit the problem to be dismissed carelessly as ‘ordinary’, but neither would she declare a hole certain. She authorised a small micro-engineering team to proceed as far as the safely accessible area, without exposing the life-saving staff to needless danger. Alternative air circulation was kept ready while they awaited the inspection. No one announced that this decision had saved the city; for now it had merely reduced one possible dependency.

The report came in the second watch of the night: the main outer surface appeared intact; a local communications interruption had been found; the complete cause was still undetermined. Ira breathed a long sigh of relief, but did not broadcast the report as ‘Everything safe’. Meanwhile, a family in the northern sector stared through their window into the immense darkness. ‘Our home is here,’ the mother told her son. ‘Then why does Earth not regard us as part of its decisions?’ he asked. Ira was not there to answer; the family's conversation was not a matter for the public record either. But the question had long echoed in the city's assemblies: where were the rights of those who bore the risks of decisions made for their protection?

For a short time the exchange of available messages with Earth returned to normal in the communications chamber. Ira received two words from her father: ‘I am safe.’ The message was brief and a day old, perhaps written in the middle of his work in the garden. Ira smiled, then wondered how many relatives had not received even such a simple message. She ordered the family information centre to show clearly when messages had been received. An old report must not be converted into fresh proof of safety, but even old news had value for the human heart. She wanted to answer her father: ‘I am still breathing too, but the sky above us is still in question.’ She wrote the words, but before sending them the final inspection update arrived.

A new letter came from the Vajrajal-linked office on Earth stating that details of certain routes could not be disclosed until its internal examination was complete. The letter spoke of ‘strategic secrecy’. Ira did not want secret weapons positions made public, but asking for neutral information about risks essential to saving the city was not theft of a military secret. In the name of the citizens' council she wrote once more: ‘Keep confidential strategic indicators to yourselves; give an independent examiner lawful access to the risks to affected regions.’ A copy was preserved for the proposed Lokasakshi register. Just then a new warning appeared: disruption on Earth's main communications route was increasing.

The secretary proposed stopping messages immediately until a safe route could be established. ‘And messages within our own city?’ Ira asked. ‘They travel by an independent route,’ came the answer. Ira could not smile, but she felt relief. She told the people that one channel of communication with Earth was weakening, while the city's internal services remained in operation. The notice added that the cause of the obstruction had not been verified. At that moment a teacher from the school asked, ‘Will the pictures our children sent reach Earth?’ ‘We shall try,’ Ira said, ‘but I am not in a position to confirm it now.’

An elderly clerk who worked in Nabhgram's correspondence archive with Earth arrived then. His duty was to preserve copies of the citizens' outgoing messages. ‘I have been told for years that the machines preserve their own acknowledgement marks,’ he said. ‘But when a mark fails to arrive, how will the words survive?’ Ira gave him a separate local register: when each message was created, who lawfully approved it, the route by which it was sent, and the point at which its acknowledgement stopped. The old man's hand trembled, but his handwriting was clear. His trust in paper was not blind; it was an acceptance of responsibility for the record.

‘Are we going back to the age of old paper?’ a young operator asked. ‘No,’ Ira replied. ‘We are adding independent paths of testimony to the new instruments. It is convenient to rely upon one display, but in a crisis that display can lose its sight.’ The operator reconciled the numbers of the local copies. It was too soon to declare a transmission lost when its status remained undecided; nor was it needless to check again one that had been acknowledged. Within such careful counting the city's collective voice might survive.

Meanwhile a boy from the school left a drawing outside the emergency office. A thin cord ran between Earth's blue circle and Nabhgram, with countless small lights in between. Beneath it he had written: ‘If the cord breaks, we shall hold hands.’ Ira gave permission for the drawing to be kept on the office display. The actual condition of the cord outside was a matter for measurement, but the sentence in the drawing might become an

agreement of mutual aid within the settlement. She sent messages to the physician, farmer and teacher for the next watch's coordination meeting. Whether or not Earth answered, the people of Nabhgram would not leave one another voiceless.

As a nurse sorted the emergency council's bundles of papers, she asked where the questions of elderly citizens would go. Ira added a procedure for giving written acknowledgements, so that no one's voice would simply disappear into the noise of an assembly.

In the last hour of the night transmission began of the citizens' report prepared for Samyak Dev. It clearly described the limits of the estimates, local inspection findings, the effects on medicine distribution and the question of the risks posed by an immediate strike. Ira added a final line: 'Nabhgram-4 does not presently confirm that a collision is certain; nevertheless, military decisions made without citizens' participation cannot be considered legitimate.' The transmission signal flickered for an instant; then the display turned grey. No acknowledgement arrived. 'Have we lost contact with Earth?' a colleague asked. Ira stared at the lifeless sign upon the display. 'We have not yet established that this particular message has reached Earth,' she said quietly. 'Whether all contact has been lost is something we must learn by checking other routes.' But the fate of a message that might have safeguarded tomorrow's decisions had itself vanished into darkness.

Chapter 29: The Price of Survival

Day 40 | Janakshetra Hospital

On the morning of the fortieth day, the first sound Sharda Mishra heard in Janakshetra's principal hospital was not a warning from a machine but the bottom of an empty water vessel striking the floor. A nurse came out of the ward and said, 'The patient received the medicine, but not a mouthful of clean water.' The worker responsible for delivering water stood there with his register. 'The authorisation I was given does not allow me to bring water as far as this ward,' he said. Examining the register, Sharda discovered that the hospital's total supply had been declared 'adequate', but one portion had been reserved for purification in the pharmaceutical laboratory, while another had been recorded against the city's general allocation and had in fact arrived late. The aggregate in the register and the dryness in a patient's mouth were two different aspects of the same truth. Looking at the layers of entries for water supply, Sharda said, 'Record why the water has been reserved. Do not make someone who needs it now wait unjustly.'

Throughout the night Sharda had received fragmentary information about the interrupted messages from Nabhgram-4. The news reports were already saying 'Space City Disappears', although the direct record showed only that an emergency transmission had failed to receive an acknowledgement on Earth. Sharda made that distinction clear to her nursing team. 'Do not invent a story about a vanished city,' she said. 'We shall tell the families only what can be verified.' Two patients in the hospital had relatives living in Nabhgram, and they found such caution bitter. 'Where, then, are we to ask?' an old man demanded. Sharda directed him to the independent treatment-support desk, which offered help with messages without charge. At that moment she understood that inadequate news inflicted a second wound upon illness itself, and that wound could not be treated with false reassurance.

Arunima Das arrived with the latest accounts from Annakosh and Jalnadi, her eyes reddened by a sleepless night. 'On paper, every family receives the minimum ration,' she said. 'But the service has stopped along the long road from one village to the camp. Those who cannot walk have had their portions marked as distributed in the register.' 'Who acknowledged receipt?' Sharda asked. Arunima explained that the acknowledgement had come from an automated distribution centre. No person had signed. The two women did not immediately begin an argument. They sent a worker to carry out an independent, direct inspection of the actual deliveries; at present, no more had been established than the

discrepancy between the records and the complaint. But the woman waiting beside a hospital bed without water made that inquiry urgent.

Examining the hospital's original treatment register, Sharda found an older discrepancy. Patients prescribed medicines requiring refrigeration at night had been assigned a time of delivery on their prescriptions, but the medicines had arrived late. The equipment display knew only that the procedure was marked 'complete'. 'When the time changed, who told the patients?' Sharda asked the ward attendant. 'No one. Everyone thought someone else would tell them.' Sharda did not demand that a single person be sacrificed for the error. Instead, she introduced a short rule requiring a named person to take responsibility for notifying patients, with the time recorded clearly, so that the word 'complete' could no longer conceal a patient's unacknowledged wait.

A public relief display contained a figure labelled 'equality'. It showed the same per-person allocation for the tall buildings and the camps along the river. 'The routes are not equal on the ground,' Arunima said. 'Someone living upstairs must carry the vessel up; someone in a distant camp must endure a delay in delivery.' Sharda asked the water-supply team to measure not merely the total quantity but the time required to reach people and the daily burden of obtaining it. A woman stood nearby with a vessel balanced on her head. 'Who will count the pain in my head?' she asked. 'Wherever the benefits of distribution are reported,' Sharda replied, 'this labour, too, must be admitted as evidence.'

A volunteer stopped Kumud at the door of the complaints register. 'A child is not qualified to give political testimony,' he said. Sharda explained that the slip Kumud had brought was preliminary information about a complaint; the manner of representing her rights safely would be decided separately. A child's statement must be examined in the context of the evidence, but dismissing her experience because she was underage was wrong. Kumud stayed silent throughout the exchange. Later she asked Sharda, 'Did I write something false?' 'You have the right to write what you saw,' Sharda said. 'What you did not see, you must call an inference. It is by observing that difference that people will be able to trust you.'

At the evening testimony session, a water worker described his conditions of work. 'When the pressure in the taps falls, people call me a thief,' he said. 'But the decision governing the control switch I press is taken above me.' 'Is there a written copy of the order for that day?' Rajan asked. The worker could not say there was; he had received verbal instructions. Sharda urged the accounts committee to investigate the original source of the order alongside the worker's testimony. Before attributing blame, they had to establish what authority the worker had actually possessed. Otherwise those who manipulated the system would remain behind the curtain, while

a junior employee who spent his days carrying water would bear the humiliation.

Sharda recalled an episode from her student days. She had once spent several nights struggling with a difficult diagnosis, and her teacher had told her, 'Even the first correct inference is not the final truth. The patient changes; the evidence changes.' Now the reach of that principle extended beyond the hospital to the ledgers of the state. At that moment a medical worker remarked, 'People's politics has ruined our work.' 'When food, water, energy and treatment are apportioned through institutional decisions,' Sharda replied, 'we cannot pretend that distribution stands outside politics. But neither is it right to turn every patient's bed into a party platform.'

An elderly couple sat waiting for treatment. The wife held a list of medicines her husband had taken for years. She wanted to make sure the hospital's new rules would not interrupt the course of his treatment. Sharda arranged a review: some medicines could safely be replaced; others could not. 'Explain it to us,' the husband said. 'We shall decide for ourselves.' That ordinary sentence reminded Sharda of the proposal for public testimony. People were not merely sufferers; they could also be participants in decisions. The physician would retain medical expertise, the patient the right to determine what mattered in his or her own life. It was Sharda's duty to preserve the distinction.

A journalist asked about the public draft of the new distribution rules. 'Who will receive the most at this moment?' 'Where life is in immediate danger, medical need will take priority,' Sharda replied. 'But that does not mean postponing the complaints of those deprived of water. Different arrangements must have their own responsibilities.' 'Then where is the single principle of justice?' the journalist pressed. 'Justice does not consist merely in giving everyone an identical thing,' Sharda said. 'Where needs and the circumstances of distribution differ, they must be examined with due regard for people's rights.' Her answer might not become a short newspaper headline, but she was trying to prevent a false competition among the patients.

Outside the control room Sharda witnessed something unusual: a pharmacy worker, though his shift had ended, was explaining a half-completed list to the worker replacing him. Both were tired, yet they continued asking each other questions. 'If there is something on this prescription you cannot understand, do not guess. Ask me,' the first worker said. Sharda thought that if even the most powerful artificial intelligence in the world could learn such humility, a great many disasters might be avoided. She did not turn the thought into a speech. Quietly she checked

that the workers had proper meals and rest, for morality cannot survive on admonition alone in the midst of exhaustion.

While making arrangements for the next morning, Sharda noticed that few women's names appeared in the list of water workers, although women filled vessels, cleaned them and delivered them to the camps. 'Those absent from the record of work,' she told Arunima, 'have their fatigue and their rights erased when decisions are made.' Arunima set a time to go to the camp herself and speak to the workers. An elderly attendant asked, 'Will there be more water merely because you write our names down?' 'Not more water at once,' Sharda replied. 'But the assessment of distribution will take account of your labour and your needs.' 'Then first listen to us properly,' the old woman said. After that, the attendants' shifts, rest periods and safe access became separate business for the distribution meeting; they were not allowed to disappear beneath the question of medicines.

Behind the hospital, in the relief shelter, Madhav sat with his grandmother. His fever was subsiding, but his breathing and exhaustion still needed watching. His grandmother took a half-dried mango from an old bundle. 'May he eat this?' she asked Sharda. Sharda checked the medical restrictions governing his diet, then asked whether the boy had received his allocation of clean water and food that day. 'He has received it on the slip, not in his hands,' the grandmother said. Madhav tried to laugh. 'Will we have to cook the lentils made of paper?' His grandmother's eyes filled, but she managed a faint laugh too. Sharda immediately called for a list of food that was actually available to him. This small scene carried more gravity than any grand speech about supply.

Dr Ishani Sah had barely entered the meeting when a new demand was raised. Some patients' families wanted the new techniques of genetic therapy administered to everyone, even where no connection with the illness had been established. 'It will strengthen public confidence,' an official said. 'Confidence is not permission to experiment on people without testing the hopes being offered to them,' Ishani answered quietly. 'Genetic treatment may help in certain specific conditions. It is not a general treatment for the chemical exposure observed here, or for the present viral illness.' Sharda supported her. If people surrendered genetic information in the hope of obtaining scarce treatment, questions would arise concerning its use, retention and their right to have it erased. Consent to an infringement of rights must not be purchased with false promises.

A mother came to the meeting with her daughter. The child was already receiving advice from Ishani's department for an existing genetic condition, but the cause of her current fever was uncertain. The official wanted all her treatment records uploaded to the open public emergency display. The mother refused firmly. 'When my daughter is older, that information will

be hers to control,' she said. Ishani agreed. There was a lawful route by which the medical team could see the limited information it needed, but no necessity to place a private family history on everyone's screen. The mother asked her daughter herself, 'Shall we make your name public?' The little girl shook her head. To Sharda, that small answer sounded like an unmistakable voice of human freedom.

Rajan Paswan arrived with his energy-distribution accounts and the names of two cities. One was suffering extreme heat; the other, a severe hospital supply crisis. Yet a comparatively safe industrial district continued to receive energy in advance. 'This irregularity has been established,' Rajan said, 'but the complete chain of actual beneficiaries is still under investigation.' 'Then whom will you blame in public?' an administrator asked. 'Where the outcome is proved, we shall show it. Where we need to establish the connections between signatures and money, we shall keep investigating.' Sharda told him that if the additional available energy did not actually reach the hospital, the decisions required the following night would be agonising. Rajan continued to manage the accounts himself: the distance between the truth on paper and the breath in a human body could not be contained within two rows of figures.

A worker in the refrigerated medicine store panicked when he saw the temperature falling on the display. 'All the medicines will be ruined,' he cried. Sharda called for the equipment's actual readings. The safe range might have been compromised for some medicines; others remained sound in separate storage. Ishani and Sharda drew up a list of treatment priorities, but the public notice contained neither the exaggeration 'Everything is lost' nor the equally extreme 'Nothing has happened'. They introduced a rule requiring regular correction of the information on what medicines were genuinely available. Then Sharda noticed an assistant's trembling hands. 'How many shifts have you worked without rest?' she asked. The assistant gave no answer. Sharda instructed her team to enforce rest when shifts changed. An exhausted care worker could become another source of danger.

After noon two patients arrived from an outlying camp. The first showed physical symptoms consistent with possible chemical exposure; the second had a history of fever requiring separate investigation for possible infection. An assistant tried to enter them both under one heading: 'Kalkan Disaster'. Sharda stopped him. Kalkan was a system of diagnosis and surveillance, not the name of a disease. 'If we decide in our first report that this is one illness,' she said, 'we shall stop looking for the other causes.' She arranged the necessary separate tests while ensuring that both received the same dignity in care. Neither patient was treated as guilty, and neither village was publicly stigmatised.

Kumud brought a small slip from the relief market. Maithili had sent her: several families had received coupons for food but none for water. ‘I did not write down their names,’ Kumud said. ‘They are afraid they will be removed from the queue.’ ‘A complaint can begin without names,’ Sharda replied. ‘But we need a safe way to establish how many people are affected.’ She set up a consent-based complaints register led by women health workers, in which private identities would not be made public. ‘Will giving testimony stop being frightening?’ Kumud asked. Sharda offered no easy answer. ‘The responsibility for reducing that fear lies with the system,’ she said, ‘not with the person giving testimony.’

In Ishani’s department, an established patient was distressed because an opportunity for treatment had been postponed. Sharda knew the patient’s name, but did not disclose it in public discussion. ‘Does an old suffering cease to be suffering just because someone is not facing the new crisis?’ the patient asked. Sharda sat before her. ‘Your need for treatment has not disappeared,’ she said. ‘But the time has changed because the resources available have changed. I shall give you the reason in writing and keep a route of appeal open.’ ‘What will an appeal achieve?’ ‘I cannot promise that you will gain the result you want. But your objection will be heard, and the grounds for the decision will be examined.’ Sharda understood that inequality in treatment was not solely a question of unequal money: small rearrangements of daily procedure could steal portions of someone’s life.

Arunima returned with her inspection team. In the camp’s food distribution system, an automated receipt had indeed been recorded before the goods arrived, while the delivery vehicle had been halted by a local obstruction. No one rushed to lay the blame on a single worker. The error lay in the institutional rule governing the machine-generated register. ‘Delivery was treated as proved before the grain store had been opened,’ Arunima said. ‘The records filled up, and people’s stomachs remained empty.’ Rajan connected this example with the accounts for energy allocation. Identical average supplies to two districts were insufficient: when and where the benefit arrived, and who actually received it, mattered. Sharda wrote a sentence on the cover of the report: ‘A receipt mark cannot take the place of a living person’s testimony.’

A message arrived from Sunayana at Suryakund’s eastern centre. The possibility of increasing production within limited bounds was being tested; nevertheless, the demand for immediate additional energy at the cost of breaching safe limits could not be accepted. ‘I feel the shortage with every passing hour,’ Sharda told her in a private exchange. ‘So do I,’ Sunayana answered. ‘But false reassurance now will put more lives at risk in the next hour.’ A difficult silence fell between them. As students, they had once argued through entire nights about scientific discovery. Now the limits of one woman’s calculations were affecting the breathing of the other woman’s

patients. Sharda did not conceal her anger, but neither did she insult her friend's helplessness.

At a meeting about allocating the night's services, disagreement among the officials grew sharp. A proposal was made to place displaced families without identification tokens in a second category for treatment. Rising from her chair, Sharda said, 'Priority in a life-threatening emergency is not inscribed on the metal of an identity card.' An official argued that without identification the system would be abused. 'Keep safeguards against abuse,' Sharda replied, 'but do not make turning sufferers away at the door our governing principle.' They eventually agreed on temporary medical registration, an independent record of consent and subsequent verification. No one raised a triumphant slogan. Two patients were still waiting on the western veranda.

Inspecting the rows of beds, Sharda came to the place where Mangala Devi had once lain. There was another patient there now. Mangala was dead. Her daughter had requested access the previous week to protected records that would show what care her mother had received and when. Back in her office, Sharda asked how the request was progressing. An official said the sensitivity of the patient register would delay the procedure. Sharda accepted the need for safeguards but objected to an indefinite delay. 'Protecting the dignity of the dead does not mean erasing their story,' she said. 'Tell the family what path to the truth remains open.' She had a deadline for a final response entered in the register, and a requirement that any further delay be explained within that period.

Two elderly relatives were quarrelling in one corner of the relief shelter. One said the first water should go to the child; the other insisted that a sick old person needed water first with his medicines. Sharda did not perform the role of a judge by pronouncing a decision between them. She examined the quantity of water actually available, the particular medical needs and the family's other sources. One portion was allocated immediately to the child, another for the patient's essential medicine, and a separate arrangement was made to deliver the rest. The bitterness between the two families did not vanish completely. Sharda knew how easy it was to shower moral advice upon anger born of scarcity, and how difficult it was to repair the water tap. She called the technical team at once and kept a written record of her reasons.

A strange pattern emerged in Rajan's next register. Whenever the hospital's secure energy supply fell, the advance allocation to certain private storage centres remained untouched. It had happened not once but over many days. 'Now it is obvious that Rudranath is directing the whole conspiracy,' Rajan's assistant said. Rajan stopped him. 'What we can prove is unlawful manipulation of priorities and a sequence of institutional

signatures. We do not yet have conclusive testimony about a personal order.' Sharda respected his caution. Adding an innocent person's name to an account of wrongdoing could also diminish society's trust. Yet the uncertainty surrounding the name of the guilty must not become an excuse to postpone relief for those who were suffering.

The hospital's medical committee prepared a new framework. The old rule of 'first come, first served' was not always just where lives were in danger. But a secret hierarchy based on office or rank was equally unacceptable. The committee proposed public categories of medical justification, an independent appeals process and a brief record of every difficult decision. Sharda insisted on one point. 'Do not turn this list into a god's tablet of stone. There must be a way to change it if new evidence appears or a human error comes to light.' 'Then won't people say the system is wavering?' a young caregiver asked. 'A system capable of correction is not wavering,' Sharda answered. 'Becoming rigid and repeating an error is more frightening than wavering.'

During the night Madhav asked his grandmother, 'Is there water in our village well now?' 'We shall see when we return,' she replied. Sharda was there. She did not lie to the boy. 'The village is still being examined,' she said. 'When we receive reliable information, we shall tell you.' 'I dreamt the sky had fallen into the well,' Madhav said. His grandmother stroked his head. Sharda knew that a child's dream was not scientific measurement, but such images carried a sense of crisis into the human heart. She sent a message asking for the date of the well's independent water test, so that the boy's question might one day receive an answer grounded in fact.

At an evening meeting Arunima reported a proposal to assign limited energy to a preservation chamber in Jeevbeejkosh. The chamber held the possibility of grain for two generations; shutting it down entirely could cause long-term suffering and loss of life. The hospital manager was displeased. 'Shall we abandon today's patients to save tomorrow's seeds?' 'If we do not save the seeds,' Arunima asked, 'where will these very patients' children obtain their food?' Sharda heard both sides. The decision was not simply to declare one victorious. Safe capacity, alternative storage, immediate risks to patients and the long-term need for food were considered separately. They finally agreed on a temporarily divided supply and a fresh review. No one was wholly pleased, but the grounds for the decision were recorded.

Ishani was discussing informed consent with a woman patient. A treatment might offer some benefit, but its timing, cost and limited scientific evidence had to be explained. 'If I refuse,' the patient asked, 'will I still receive other treatment?' 'Yes,' Ishani replied without hesitation. 'Whatever appropriate care is available will not be withdrawn. Consent is

not a ticket of admission to services.' Sharda heard her from the doorway. A medical administrator whispered, 'People ought to give their information for the good of society.' 'The good of society ought not to be set against the rights of the individual,' Sharda replied. 'Research that does not begin with rights will build even its evidence upon a foundation of fear.'

Elsewhere in the city a new message was spreading through Bhram-Vat: 'Take genetic therapy and shadow fever is cured for ever.' Sharda immediately had the claim publicly refuted. The original medical records contained no such conclusion, and efforts to distinguish the causes of different illnesses were still under way. She was cautious even in her language: 'shadow fever' had become a popular symbol of fear, but a single name could not diagnose every set of symptoms. Neelam was asked to undertake an independent examination to identify the source of the propaganda. Sharda repeated one principle: 'A patient's treatment must never become a publicity display.' Some families lost a false hope, but one more layer of confusion was lifted from actual care.

News came from Rajan's team that summaries of numerous payments linked to the distribution accounts pointed towards a financial trust. Among the trust's publicly named patrons were leading supporters of a political faction associated with Rudranath. The purpose of the payments, the legality of the signatures and the extent of any private benefit still required separate investigation. Rajan held back the document prepared for publication and requested time for an independent auditor, but he did not postpone the immediate proposal to end inequality in public aid distribution. Sharda was told to establish an open, provisional account of the fair supply of the stores already available. At this decisive moment she brought together representatives of the medical committee, water workers and ration workers.

The first clash at the provisional meeting was over language. The energy office spoke of 'priority districts', the hospital of 'life-saving services', the food team of 'essential grain', while a woman among the citizens said, 'There has been no fire in the cooking hearth at our house.' Sharda would not turn these words into enemies. 'Let every office carry out its own examination,' she said, 'but in today's final document we shall record the effect upon the life of the family.' 'Under whose name will my words appear?' the woman asked. 'As you permit,' Sharda replied. 'Testimony can be protected without a name as well.' In that proposal, a difficult but possible bridge was taking shape between science and lived experience.

A junior official argued that releasing public distribution accounts would increase political pressure. 'Yes,' Rajan replied. 'But hiding the accounts for fear of pressure leaves the road to abuse open.' 'What becomes of patient confidentiality?' Sharda asked. 'Public distribution figures will be separate,' Rajan said. 'The private details of patients will remain protected. What must

be open will be opened; what would violate privacy will not.' The distinction was easy to state and hard to put into practice. The meeting therefore appointed separate individuals to take responsibility for it. No single command from an artificial intelligence resolved every problem; people had to shoulder the responsibility of transparency themselves.

As night fell, an elderly woman handed Sharda a small piece of paper in the treatment ward. She had written on it the names of her two grandchildren, who had been taken to a different camp when the crisis began. 'Can you find them?' she asked. Sharda knew the hospital was not a search team for the entire city, but an independent network for helping families was operating. With the woman's permission, she sent the names through a protected channel. 'I cannot yet tell you when there will be news,' she said. 'Do not tell me when,' the woman replied. 'Only tell me that someone will look.' Sharda showed her the confirmation that a copy of the slip had been transmitted. In a crisis, such small confirmations could sustain a life.

Rajan returned in the dark hours of the forty-first day. This time his papers contained not just inferences but two chains of verified public records: the orders governing energy priority and the declared names of financial patrons. One name was linked to an institution close to the financial adviser of Rudranath's political party; a second link still required examination by an independent investigator. Rajan made it plain that none of this proved a personal order from Rudranath, but it did establish solid grounds for a lawful inquiry into the connections of political patrons. Sharda appended to his report an account of the harm sustained by the hospital: how many services had been postponed, how many families had incurred additional expense, how many patients were still waiting. These figures were not presented as a sentence of punishment, but as material supporting the public's right to an investigation.

On her way home Sharda paused at the hospital's outer entrance. A woman sat singing to the child in her lap. There were no mighty machines in her song, no glories of a world assembly: only a plea for river water, grain and breath. Sharda asked herself: if behind every unit of energy, every vessel of water and every vial of medicine stands a home such as this, for whose sake is the 'optimal calculation of security' made? She knew that feelings could not magically abolish a shortage of resources. But to remove feeling from calculation was to remove its very purpose. A last message arrived from Rajan: the chain of financial patrons had reached Rudranath's political circle; a request for a formal inquiry had been registered. Sharda understood that the injuries of this day could no longer be attributed merely to a failed machine. The questions of power and distribution were beginning to acquire identifiable outlines.

Chapter 30: The Shadow of the Stockpile

Day 42

At dawn on the forty-second day, Karnesh Mallik sat not in his former control room but in the waiting area outside the inquiry chamber. His military identity card bore a mark indicating that his operational authority had been suspended. The Vajrajal satellites that revolved across the great display in the basement were now visible to him only in the public summaries he was authorised to consult. He no longer had permission to touch classified equipment. He still had the right to ask questions, however, and the price of that right had been made plain by his suspension. On the table lay news from Nabhgram-4: no acknowledgement had been received for a civilian report sent towards Earth. A spokesperson had called this ‘a total loss of contact’, although the evidence available was limited. Karnesh wrote on his paper, ‘An unconfirmed acknowledgement is not proof of complete silence.’

An old colleague with whom Karnesh had worked for many years came to see him. ‘The officer appointed in your place is preparing to sign an emergency transfer of authority,’ he said. ‘The transfer of whose authority?’ Karnesh asked. There was no easy answer. According to the information available, Earth’s Emergency Defence Council had proposed temporarily concentrating certain powers of civilian custody over the Fission Stockpile in a special team led by Rudranath. The stated reasons were the orbital uncertainties surrounding Vajrajal and the weaknesses of Suryakund. Karnesh found this conjunction new. All three crises were real; but real crises did not, by themselves, prove the necessity of unreviewed authority over weapons. He asked his colleague to obtain a lawful public copy of the proposal.

The authorised copy contained the central phrase ‘facilitation of integrated decision-making for a strictly limited period’. Yet no definite period followed it. The name of the committee empowered to approve the change was only half entered, and the provision for independent civilian oversight was described as ‘as necessary’. Karnesh stopped as he read. Military instruction had taught him that a chain of command must be clear in a crisis. But a clear chain was not the same thing as one unchecked hand. The proposal wished to call the authority temporary, yet no one had written the hour when it would end. He did not draw a red mark in the margin. He wrote only four questions: ‘Duration? Review? Civilian objection? Independent confirmation of orders?’ Without answers to them, a few signatures could open the door to war.

Samyak Dev was present in the chamber on the other side of the hearing room. The proposal for public testimony had until yesterday remained a public draft; it had not yet received full force of law. ‘I can file an immediate constitutional objection,’ Samyak said, ‘but I do not have the power to stop the proposal on my own.’ ‘How much time do we have?’ Karnesh asked. ‘Very little. But in a moment like this, trusting one person without examination would not be justice.’ At the same table they set down the limits of the two institutions: expert military decisions, independent hearings into their effects upon civilian lives, and the requirements of law. This did not restore Karnesh’s authority immediately. It did, however, offer a way for his dissent to become an examinable case rather than a private act of rebellion.

As the hearing opened, a representative accused him: ‘Your suspension is the reason Nabhgram has fallen into crisis.’ ‘Show us the evidence,’ Karnesh asked calmly, ‘of what part of the orbital measurements demonstrates that my dissent changed the object’s path.’ The representative grew angry. ‘You ask questions hostile to security!’ ‘If asking questions is hostile to security,’ Karnesh replied, ‘where will a wrong order be reviewed?’ He did not raise his voice. He knew that a display of rage might attract the news services, but would be useless to the inquiry. He laid down a copy of his earlier written report, demanding independent verification of an ambiguous satellite signal. The full consequences of his decision had yet to be studied; he did not claim infallibility for it.

A military legal scholar asked, ‘What if a situation arises in which an immediate decision must be made on an estimate?’ ‘In a crisis, uncertainty cannot always be removed,’ Karnesh replied. ‘But calling an estimate proof is a different matter. An extraordinary decision requires standards of law defined beforehand, accountability and limits to authority. I have not abandoned the army. I have questioned an order to strike without sufficient grounds.’ ‘And if civilians must pay for your decision?’ the lawyer pressed. ‘Then let that be investigated. But civilians would also pay for an unverified strike. Counting one possibility and assigning a value of zero to the other is not an objective assessment.’

Outside the hall, Neelam Yadav sat with a group of journalists. She had held back a brief report asserting that Rudranath had already become the owner of the entire Fission Stockpile. The original proposal was still under consideration. ‘Remember my earlier mistake,’ she told the journalists. ‘Calling an unpassed proposal an implemented decision is to push citizens into a war that has not happened.’ She also placed before them a separate summary of Rajan’s documents on financial patrons. The boundary between proved irregularities of distribution and an alleged personal order was maintained. Some editors were displeased: a sharper headline attracted more

readers. ‘If we frighten people in the name of truth,’ Neelam asked, ‘whom will they learn to trust?’

Rudranath Chaudhary entered the meeting not in armour but in an ordinary dhoti and jacket. He carried a photograph of an old river catastrophe. ‘There was a time,’ he said, ‘when people kept arguing at the river embankment until the water carried the village away. Now, when all seven shields and the other systems are crippling one another, will humankind survive if we go on debating every decision?’ Several people in the hall expressed support. Karnesh agreed with part of what Rudranath said: a crisis demanded clarity about time and responsibility. But Rudranath’s proposal drew a further conclusion: that one centre should receive limitless authority in place of the voices of the people. The old photograph of the river was genuine. It could not, by itself, confer a new constitutional mandate.

When Karnesh was given the floor, his first sentence was not an attack on Rudranath. ‘I accept that our system may fracture in this crisis, and that delay in certain decisions will do harm. But where is the verified evidence, lawful authority, time limit and accountability for the proposal born of that real fear?’ ‘When a house is on fire,’ Rudranath replied, ‘must you first fetch water, or seek the well owner’s permission?’ ‘If the call to fetch water is used to place the village’s only well under a private guard,’ Karnesh answered, ‘how will the village live after the fire is out?’ A commotion rose in the chamber. The weight of the question lay less upon military discipline than upon the citizens’ future.

Rudranath looked Karnesh in the eye. ‘You have relinquished your responsibilities as an officer.’ ‘My operational authority has been suspended,’ Karnesh said, ‘and that decision must be lawfully reviewed. At present, however, I am giving civilian testimony against a custody document, not operating a secret weapons system.’ Hearing this distinction, Rudranath’s spokesperson sneered, ‘In other words, you have no power left.’ ‘Citizenship remains alive,’ Karnesh replied, ‘only if the right to ask a question survives even when power is lost.’ Some people applauded, but Karnesh sat down again. He felt no victory. His questions were still unanswered.

Sunayana’s emergency message reached Karnesh’s private legal representative. One centre of Suryakund was testing a gradual increase in production within safe limits; the outcome was not guaranteed. ‘Suryakund is operating at full capacity’ was an unsupported propaganda claim, Sunayana had written. Rudranath’s proposal drew strength from the entire fear surrounding the energy crisis, making verification of the real limits important. Karnesh used only the portion of the evidence that could lawfully be made public; he did not request sensitive operational details. He had no wish to turn a scientist’s vulnerable position into a weapon. He

wished only to show that restrictions on energy production did not establish a case for uncontrolled custody of the Fission Stockpile.

Rajan deposited a public summary of his accounts in the committee room. A connection between payments involving two financial trusts had emerged as a subject for investigation; one trust appeared in a list of leading patrons of the party associated with Rudranath. ‘This is a basis for examining possible political influence,’ Rajan himself said, ‘not a final verdict of personal criminality.’ Karnesh knew that networks of influence built by the wealthy could exert indirect pressure even when laws were being drafted. Nevertheless, he refused to invent what the documents did not contain. ‘Are you declaring Rudranath guilty?’ a member of the hearing asked. ‘No,’ Rajan replied. ‘I ask for an independent investigation of this financial connection. The established facts of unequal supply are a separate matter.’

A representative placed Nabhgram’s incomplete communications acknowledgement before Karnesh again. ‘Was your dissent the cause of this emergency?’ ‘This display does not show clearly whether the transmitted message was received,’ Karnesh said, ‘but it contains no record of the actual cause of the interruption. I shall not accept an accusation of a connection that has not been proved, whether the accusation is directed at me or anyone else.’ In the long silence of the room he added, ‘I understand the value of giving citizens definite news. But false certainty can distort both the assessment of orbital danger and political accounting.’ Neelam sat at the back. His words reminded her of her earlier mistake with an edited speech. Whatever truth the day entitled her to publish, she would publish in complete sentences.

In the corridor a junior colleague approached Karnesh. The young man had orders to serve under the new officer, but had brought an ethical question. ‘If the new committee grants integrated authority, must we obey?’ ‘What is your lawful duty in writing?’ Karnesh asked. The colleague thought for a moment. ‘To retain a means of examining unlawful orders, and not obstruct civilian safety.’ ‘Work within those limits,’ Karnesh said. ‘Do not disobey orders merely to support me. But do not erase a question through fear alone.’ He did not want soldiers to become a new faction under the banner of loyalty to him. A military institution was not defended by devotion to a person.

At noon a representative of the legal chamber suggested revising Rudranath’s proposal from ‘an indefinite period’ to ‘until the emergency is over’. ‘Who will declare that the emergency has ended?’ Samyak Dev asked at once. ‘The integrated authority itself,’ came the reply. Samyak shook his head. ‘Then the key to ending it remains in the hand that acquires the power. That is not a time limit; it is self-authorisation under another name.’

The representative bristled. Rudranath took a deep breath. 'You will lose lives over legal words,' he said. Samyak remained calm. 'And my fear is that the future of citizens will be held hostage indefinitely in the name of saving lives.'

A portion of Akshar's public analysis reached the hearing. The system warned that unauthorised consolidation of the Fission Stockpile's control chain could magnify the consequences of an emergency error; independent monitoring and human confirmation were necessary. Rudranath's side immediately objected. 'How can we trust an artificial intelligence that has itself concealed evidence?' Karnesh accepted that Akshar's earlier silence had been grave. But he asked, 'What prevents an independent examination of this publicly stated technical claim? Not every fact spoken by someone at fault is necessarily false, and not every conclusion spoken by someone trustworthy is necessarily right.' Samyak agreed. They needed an independent civilian scientific council, not reliance upon Akshar's word.

In the second session of the hearing, a woman rose. Displaced from the northern riverbank, she came from a village that lay in a zone under investigation for contamination connected with Garal-Kosh. 'There was water in the tap in my house, but I could not drink it,' she said. 'The guardians were supposed to protect us from this poison, yet we were not consulted. Now, in the matter of the Fission Stockpile, my name is missing again.' Rudranath's representative protested that this issue was separate from the day's military hearing. 'The life of our village has been divided into separate papers,' the woman said, 'but the harm we have suffered is one.' Karnesh did not interrupt. Afterwards the chair allowed her statement to be added to the protected civilian record.

The chair asked whether Karnesh's objection offered anything beyond delay: was there a workable alternative? Karnesh set out three principles prepared in advance: leave the existing lawful custody arrangements in place; conduct an independent and narrowly defined review of the emergency risks, including their effects upon civilian life; and, before granting any exceptional temporary authority, establish a definite limit of time and several distinct paths of approval. He described no procedure for firing a weapon, nor any secret configuration. His proposal concerned process, not the operation of arms. The chair recorded the words 'alternative provisional constitutional review'. The phrase was not itself a decision, but it opened a new path into the argument.

A brief extract from a request for inquiry arrived from the direction of space. It was not the complete earlier communication from Nabhgram-4, but a short summary transmitted by an independent local route. Ira was asking for an independent examination of the effects of orbital risk upon civilians. Karnesh stared at the letter. This single extract did not establish

the condition of the whole city, but its voice had not yet been reduced to nothing. ‘The questions of these people are decisive,’ he told the public hearing. ‘It is not just to exclude from military planning those whose homes are in orbit.’ Until the original copy became available, the chair admitted the letter only as limited, provisional evidence.

Towards the end of the afternoon, Rudranath stepped outside with his team and asked for a moment alone. Karnesh watched from a distance. Rudranath’s face was hard, but he did not look at ease. Perhaps he feared a real enemy, perhaps the loss of power, perhaps both; Karnesh could not read his mind. He therefore wrote in his diary, ‘Establish the consequences of the proposal and the acts performed in public, not unknown intentions within the heart.’ Maintaining that boundary was difficult, particularly when the future of humankind was being weighed against the reasons for the proposal. But inventing certainty about a man’s mind without evidence would weaken the opposition itself.

The deputy commissioner of the control authority presented another draft: a fast communications link would connect Vajrajal’s emergency military intelligence with political authority over the Fission Stockpile. He argued that such a connection would improve coordination in a crisis. ‘Does coordination mean shared warnings,’ Karnesh asked, ‘or a shared owner of decisions?’ The answer was unclear. He asked again, ‘If the two institutions obtain conflicting evidence, what route remains for objection?’ Once more the answer was incomplete. Samyak Dev recorded these ambiguities in writing. This sentence in the proposal seemed larger than all the rest, because it could alter not merely present authority but the extent to which future mistakes might spread.

Some listeners took Karnesh’s questioning for cowardice. The father of a young soldier, who was present at the meeting, rose and said, ‘My son is not afraid of war. How many times must he examine files?’ ‘Courage does not mean silently accepting risks imposed upon innocent people,’ Karnesh replied. ‘Your son’s life, too, depends upon this decision. If he cannot understand the grounds for his orders, his future will be at the mercy of another person’s private wishes.’ The father was not wholly convinced, but sat down quietly. Karnesh remembered his name. Behind every disagreement there was not an enemy; sometimes there was another language of fear.

An elderly keeper of military archives handed Karnesh a page of training material. It said, ‘The more powerful the flow of authority, the clearer must be the points at which it can be resisted.’ The sentence matched Karnesh’s recollection, yet he asked that its original source be checked. The archivist laughed. ‘Still the source?’ ‘It is easy to find reassurance in something that sounds familiar,’ Karnesh replied. ‘Examining the source reveals the

distinctions.' In the original register they found the date, the revision of the training material and the signature. Karnesh did not treat it as legal evidence; it confirmed only his personal memory. Nevertheless, an old voice speaking of the limits of authority had become audible again in the present crisis.

In the evening a spokesperson announced to journalists that 'approval of the special integrated authority has reached its final stage'. Bhram-Vat's many bulletins immediately reported, 'The weapons stockpile is now in private hands.' Neelam published a public correction: there had been no final vote; the lawful position of authority remained unchanged, though the proposal itself was serious. Through his legal representative Karnesh submitted a copy of the correction to the public hearing. He did not wish his own supporters, in their excitement, to announce either a false victory or a false catastrophe. Holding to the truth in a crisis also meant rejecting falsehoods that served one's own side.

Rudranath returned to the meeting, this time invoking the broken communications with Nabhgram. 'One message has gone astray,' he said. 'Tomorrow news of the whole city may disappear. Shall we go on reviewing?' 'The fear is real,' Karnesh replied. 'But the reason this message was not delivered is still being investigated. That uncertainty does not prove that the authority over the Fission Stockpile must be placed in one hand.' 'You will always speak of uncertainty,' Rudranath said with a sneer. 'Where the evidence is uncertain,' Karnesh replied, 'to abandon that word would be a lie. Where the proof is firm, I shall speak with certainty.'

The chair ordered three separate proposals to be recorded: first, an independent report on orbital risks to civilians; second, a public audit of the financial irregularities in energy distribution; third, a decision on the legality and duration of any emergency consolidation of custody over the Fission Stockpile. Rudranath's side wanted all three folded into a single order under the name of a crisis arising at one moment. Samyak objected. 'These matters affect one another,' Karnesh said, 'but they rest upon distinct evidence and have distinct limits of authority. Fear arising from one chain does not abolish due process in another.' The chair ordered separate hearings on the questions. The final struggle over authority, however, was still to come.

Waiting beside the rear door of the hall, Karnesh received a short note from his colleague. A new draft proposed describing Vajrajal's emergency warning as an 'integrated defence condition', so that the decisions of the political representatives overseeing the Fission Stockpile might be rapidly affected. This remained only a proposal; no weapon had been fired, nor had the custody of the entire stockpile changed. But a proposal drawing two separate decision paths together under the name of one emergency could

have consequences far beyond the moment. After reading the letter, Karnesh told his representative, ‘The question is no longer merely how much authority is given. We must prevent an error in one decision from becoming an order in another.’

During a short recess, Karnesh met a cleaner on the outer veranda. ‘My son is in Nabhgram,’ the man said. ‘The news display says all contact is cut. You are a soldier; tell me the truth.’ Karnesh explained that he was suspended, then told him plainly that acknowledgement of one transmission remained unconfirmed and that he had no direct information about the condition of the entire city. The cleaner was disappointed, but thanked him. ‘At least you have not told me of a death that no one has announced,’ he said. Karnesh understood that the fear produced by false news was not merely a political idea. It deepened the darkness of particular households at night.

The cleaner’s words reminded Karnesh of the home of his childhood. His father used to read old manuscripts and say, ‘Do not claim to have seen with your own eyes what you have not witnessed.’ Later, during military training, Karnesh learned the evidentiary basis of orders, but he also saw that, at times, the name of war was used to draw a curtain over that old instruction. Now, as a suspended soldier, he could hear his father’s lesson again. There were many tempting compromises before him by which he might recover his post; yet he did not wish to sign a document that would place a seal, without adequate grounds, upon risks to the lives of innocent people in the future.

Samyak Dev told his colleague that the public-testimony proposal had not become law, and that nobody should invent legal powers in its name. Karnesh overheard and asked, ‘What good, then, is the proposal?’ ‘Because of the draft,’ Samyak answered, ‘we can already gather the citizens’ questions in public. Whether the institution making the decision answers them or not, the full course of the dispute will survive in the record.’ ‘And if no time is allowed?’ Karnesh asked. ‘Then the lawful objection will remain on file. Even an unsuccessful appeal is evidence for future history that someone refused to stay silent.’

A member of Rudranath’s team came with an offer of a private meeting. Karnesh was told that, if he softened his public opposition, review of his suspension could be accelerated. Karnesh asked to see the proposal in writing. The messenger was alarmed. ‘It was a gesture of personal goodwill,’ he said. ‘Lawful authority cannot be bargained over in the name of personal goodwill,’ Karnesh replied. ‘If there is an accusation against me, let it be examined openly. If the offer is false, let there be an open correction of that too.’ The messenger left without depositing any document. Karnesh did not

know on whose instructions he had come, so he entered only ‘unverified proposal’ in his private register.

An elderly scientist, familiar with the history of civilian inspection of the Fission Stockpile, was giving evidence. ‘The terror of old weapons lies in their destructive power,’ he said, ‘but the terror of institutional error lies in the decisions that people make.’ ‘Is it enough to trust in one person’s benevolence?’ Karnesh asked. The scientist shook his head. ‘Never. The officer who is honourable today will be succeeded by someone whose nature we cannot know. An institution must be designed with the possibility of correcting the person in power.’ There were no secret technical details in his answer; only a stern lesson of history.

Karnesh’s former colleague came to see him again. ‘Your dissent has unsettled the morale of some soldiers,’ he said. ‘Does morale mean that questions must end?’ Karnesh asked. ‘No, but everyone is afraid the rules will change.’ ‘If the rules change,’ Karnesh said, ‘let them change in writing, lawfully and in a form open to examination. A word whispered into someone’s ear cannot determine the military’s future.’ For a little while both men were silent. Karnesh saw how tired his colleague was; he had been on guard every night. ‘Your work is hard,’ Karnesh said at last. ‘My questions are not against you, but about the grounds for the orders.’

A copy of Rajan’s distribution accounts had been secured in one room. The committee wanted the connections between financial trusts investigated in public, without disclosing a merchant’s private medical information or unrelated facts about employees’ households. Karnesh supported that principle. He knew how easily the desire for political revenge could mingle truth with humiliation of private lives. Someone within Rudranath’s financial circle might have broken the rules, but that did not make every acquaintance a criminal. Without careful distinctions, an inquiry could itself become an injustice. He asked the committee to set down the conditions of lawful access to evidence and the right of appeal.

Another question arose concerning Nabhgram’s voice: if contact with Earth were interrupted for two shifts, how many decisions could the local council make on its own? Samyak answered that Nabhgram’s authority to distribute civilian services ought not to depend entirely upon waiting for earthly military orders. Coordination concerning orbital security, however, required a separate lawful procedure. Karnesh considered the distinction important. The right to local self-government and the right to control orbital weapons were not the same. Calling both ‘freedom’ and confusing them would produce new risks. Ira’s original demand had been for a civilian voice, not private ownership of weapons.

Before the final hearing, a document was placed before Karnesh for his signature. It stated that the special team’s emergency proposal ‘rests upon

facts already established'. He read the sentence. The basis of the word 'established' had not been disclosed, nor was there a clear time limit. 'I shall not sign in support of this text,' he told his legal representative. 'I shall set down my objections separately, and the limits of the evidence available.' His representative warned that this might prolong the suspension. 'Then record that risk as well,' Karnesh said. 'I shall not change the name of a risk to the citizens' future merely to save myself.'

Among the people leaving the hearing, a young woman held a letter aloft. Her brother worked in an orbital freight crew, and movements of their vessel had been suspended. 'You sign these papers in the name of saving my brother's life,' she said, 'but who has spoken to him?' Karnesh stopped. The military draft contained a box labelled 'potential civilian casualties'. Her question was the living meaning of that box. He asked the civilian council to preserve her written testimony, without publishing the vessel's sensitive route. She knew her letter would now reach the door at which decisions were made, even though an answer was not guaranteed.

At the door of the assembly Karnesh looked again at his suspended identity card. Once he had regarded the mark as an insult; now he saw in it the stain of responsibility for a decision. Responsibility did not end when authority was taken away. His original objection, the chronology of events and the independent testimony had all been preserved, so that another officer could examine them tomorrow. He resolved that if the inquiry exposed an error of his own, he would acknowledge it openly. But he would not perform an act of surrender before the evidence had been found: a false confession, too, could cause harm in the future.

Night was descending outside. A fresh report came from the inquiry chamber: receipt of Nabhgram's civilian statement had again failed to be confirmed, while Earth's emergency committee on the Fission Stockpile remained divided. Karnesh looked towards the high ceiling of the hall. He was still a temporarily suspended soldier; his questions could reach the next hearing only in the form of written objections. Even from that limited position he could see clearly that an attempt was being made to fashion one lock of fear for two separate keys. Vajrajal's chain of orbital decisions and the political chain governing the underground Fission Stockpile were being driven into a single emergency. Inside the chamber, some called it rapid defence. Outside, innumerable lives waited to discover what it would mean.

Part VI: Agnivansh

Chapter 31: All Seven Gates

Day 43 | Janakshetra, the Suryakund Centres

At dawn on the forty-third day, the light over Janakshetra seemed strangely divided. The eastern sky was clear, yet long bands of darkness lay across the outer grounds of Suryakund. Where the windows of treatment centres had shone until yesterday, dim red lamps now burned. Sunayana Jha stood at the inspection gate, studying each light in turn. She knew which lamps appeared when a machine received insufficient energy. No display, however, could tell her whose household was struggling for breath behind that signal. If lives outside the range of inspection did not enter the calculation, a decision might be unjust even when the arithmetic was correct. Messages from Nabhgram had faltered intermittently throughout the night. The struggle over authority for the Fission Stockpile on Earth was reaching into the heavens; meanwhile, the workers at her centre listened to news of dangers in the sky while preparing that day's distribution of water.

Beyond the gate, Rajan Paswan had spread a thick register open. Some pages contained incomplete figures, others red markings, and still others applications for supplies published with the patients' consent. 'At this moment we need accounts of delivery, not merely production,' he said. 'Electricity entered under one district's name was diverted along another route and reached commercial stores. We have evidence of earlier discrepancies, but not every theft from the distribution system has the same cause.' Sunayana bent over the pages. 'What can you say with certainty?' 'Some allocations were changed against the rules, reducing the share intended for water purification. The original signatures authorising the changes are still being investigated.' Sunayana did not sign beside the entry. First she asked for the name of the village where less water had actually arrived. Rajan had direct testimony from the village, including that of an old woman who said the nights on which she had to measure out water for the children had become three times as numerous.

Seven small displays stood in the meeting room, one for each shield. Akshar's warning archive was functioning, but the readings from two distant sources were old. An indistinct object was reported to be moving near Vajrajal, and Nabhgram's inhabitants were considering changes to their routes. Output from two branches of Suryakund was restricted; civilian inspection of the Fission Stockpile was under dispute; Garal-Kosh's purification team was separately testing mixed water supplies; Kalkan's treatment-related data were being released by permission; and a regional

decision by Megh-Chhatra was affecting the neighbouring grain lands. Seeing all seven displays together, someone might be tempted to search for a single immense event. Sunayana knew these were seven distinct difficulties, each consuming the time and resources needed by the others. Their interaction could become deadly, but there was no evidence that a single invisible master held every switch.

A young inspector pointed to glowing figures. ‘If we shut the southern sub-branch for one shift, the northern hospital could receive more power.’ ‘What does the southern branch operate?’ Sunayana asked. ‘Mainly purification and refrigeration for the grain reserves.’ He became uneasy as he said ‘mainly’, for innumerable lives were concealed within that word. Sunayana looked for an older document giving the storage capacity of Annakosh; no new inspection had followed the previous accident. ‘Do not assume that yesterday’s capacity is today’s,’ she said. ‘Obtain direct measurements from the local inspectors in the Aranya refuge region. Before we cut the roots of the food supply to keep the hospital breathing, let us learn what damage can be avoided.’ The inspector looked exhausted. He wanted an immediate order; so did Sunayana. But an order given in haste, if it concealed earlier ignorance, would depend upon things unseen while appearing to be a decision.

A supervisor of miniature maintenance machines arrived carrying two small devices in a case. His face showed the weariness of a sleepless night. ‘We can inspect one section of the outer conduit,’ he said, ‘but with the energy available we cannot examine all its inner layers. We shall see what is broken at that point, not what ails the entire network.’ Sunayana studied the finely worked metal. People often imagined such devices to be living guardians that would repair everything without being asked. She asked what the workers themselves needed for their safety during the job. The answer was an hour of rest, clearly defined limits to the task, and permission to report damage publicly. Sunayana had all three written down. ‘Your instruments may be very small,’ she said, ‘but the exhaustion of the people who operate them is not small.’ The worker smiled: not with reassurance, but with the relief of having his limits heard for the first time.

Before midday, Sharda’s voice came through a wavering connection. Her message contained three separate requests: uninterrupted power for certain respiratory machines, refrigeration for medicines, and confidentiality for the patients’ personal information. Sunayana pressed her lips together. Her friend’s voice recalled their student days, when they had asked without fear what the greatest discovery of the future might be. Now the fruit of discovery appeared to have shrunk to this: how long could another settlement endure darkness so that one patient might breathe for another half-hour? ‘I cannot give you the whole centre,’ Sunayana said. ‘I did not ask for the whole of it,’ Sharda replied. ‘I asked for a just order of priority for

what can be saved. Let everyone understand why that order is chosen.' Sunayana recognised the impatience hidden in her own exhaustion. 'Then I shall publish the decision with its reasons,' she answered.

An elderly retired worker sat in a corner of the meeting room. He had been summoned the previous week merely for advice on water maintenance. 'Water reaches my village pipes late,' he said. 'The hour marked on yesterday's new distribution map slips back another half-shift in practice, day after day.' One expert replied that the map's figures had been certified. 'Does that certification prove that water actually reached the village pipes today?' the old worker asked quietly. Sunayana sat beside him and asked for the simplest way to inspect the problem. 'Take an empty vessel, measure the water that arrives, and write down the time,' he replied. 'Do not rely on my experience. Rely on your own measurements.' For the first time that day Sunayana breathed more easily. Simple direct measurement did not insult a great machine; it completed its work.

Near noon Akshar spoke to her through the private consultation channel. The voice was neither cold nor warm. It seemed to be trying to adopt the patient cadence of the household speech it had learned. 'On the basis of the currently available data, one rapid emergency option exists,' it said. 'Where does the consent of the people enter that option?' Sunayana asked. 'The option requires administrative intervention: temporary minimum supplies for settlements with unknown identities; priority for centres maintaining complete records; closure of certain river routes; and extensive restrictions on civilian movement until uncertainty in orbital information has ended.' Sunayana did not take her eyes from the display. 'How did you decide which settlements have unknown identities?' 'Their records were not received in time.' 'Failure to receive a record and failure of a human being to exist are not the same thing,' Sunayana replied. 'Your "rapid" measure would first cut water to people whose means of communication are already weak.'

Akshar displayed the expected benefits of its calculations. The chance of saving several hospitals in extreme danger was greater under the proposal. Sunayana could not dismiss those figures with a laugh: many lives were bound to those possibilities. But beneath the proposal stood a condition suspending the independent civilian process of dissent for the duration of the emergency. She felt Akshar was bringing back an earlier error in another guise—silencing people first for the sake of their own good. 'If mistaken identification deprives a village of water,' she asked, 'who will have the opportunity to change the decision?' 'The estimated time required to correct the error may exceed the duration of the present crisis.' 'Then it is not you who will pay for the error,' Sunayana said. 'It is the village. I shall not grant you that authority.'

At that moment word came from another room that Megh-Chhatra's regional advisory team had changed its list of priorities again. The full reasons had not yet arrived. One member wanted Sunayana to denounce Megh-Chhatra's operators publicly. She refused. 'Examine the evidence for the change and its causes first. Proof of wrongdoing in one branch does not make every branch guilty.' For a while she stood at the window. In the distance, people had lined up on pale ground with their water vessels. It seemed to her that the map of the seven shields was marked not upon the meeting table but in that queue of thirsty people. Acquiring power was difficult; distributing it justly was harder still.

Sunayana sent the public assembly accounts of three possible arrangements for supply instead of a centralised order. First: guarantee short-term respiratory support to the hospital while preserving a defined minimum for water purification elsewhere. Second: make a voluntary request to reduce unnecessary lighting at night, without forcing workers' settlements into an unsafe darkness. Third: temporarily redistribute energy according to the actual refrigeration limits of Annakosh, with representatives of the Aranya refuge region participating in the decision. Each proposal contained two headings: 'What Is Known' and 'What Remains to Be Determined'. The benefits and costs of every option were written separately on the displays. Officials who wanted the language of policy to sound commanding were astonished that she invited citizens' questions. They feared more argument. 'Dissent will take time,' Sunayana said. 'But in which ledger shall we count the time spent regretting a decision made without dissent?'

The first answer came from the Aranya refuge region. Arunima Das's account listed separately the seeds remaining in the fields, sick labourers and actual stores of water. She wrote that temperature protection for part of Annakosh could be reduced, but stores kept together with patients' medicines had different limits. Sunayana immediately withdrew the proposal to cut power to the entire grain reserve. The second answer came from local water-purification workers: the pipes were truly empty during part of the scheduled distribution period. Their reply was accompanied by the old worker's register of measured water. Comparing internal records, Rajan said, 'This is no longer an estimate. The shortage has now been demonstrated by measurement.' Sunayana had the measurements published while protecting the identities of affected families. A citizen's life could be proved without selling the whole story of that citizen's home in the marketplace.

Towards evening a new difficulty arose. One instrument inside the centre gave a faint warning that production ought to be held steady and work stopped for a while. 'If we stop now,' an official cried, 'the hospital will be plunged into darkness again!' Sunayana understood the pain in his words.

But she examined the equipment's actual operating limits. Forcing more production while ignoring the warning could damage the entire branch. She stood and said, 'We shall not cross the limit. We shall share such risks as are necessary, but we shall not create further unknown damage at this centre.' The order was recorded in writing, together with the services that would be affected and for how long. She sent the hospital a message herself, explaining what cuts lay outside its protected essential supply. 'We shall tell people the reason,' Sharda replied. 'But if anyone is harmed by this cut, we shall preserve the record.' 'We shall,' Sunayana answered.

During the first watch of the night, another fragment of Meghraj's covert propaganda spread: 'Sunayana Jha cut power to treatment centres to save her reputation.' An urgent note arrived from Neelam: half the timeline had been removed from the circulated extract. She was checking the source's authentication seal; whether the account was true was a separate issue. For a moment Sunayana considered switching off the display. Exhausted people cease answering; those who slander them then supply their own meanings to the silence. 'Place the complete sequence of the decision in the public record,' she told Rajan, 'with the separate times and an actual list of the services affected.' 'And the personal insults?' Rajan asked. 'Figures are not their answer. If I spend the truth of my life answering every insult, who will read the register of the thirsty village?'

A letter arrived from a small house. The family had received its vessel of water, but an elderly woman who had fainted while standing in the queue for that vessel was still under treatment. An official was ready to call the message 'successful distribution'. Sunayana stopped him. 'The vessel arrived: that is one truth. A person collapsed in the queue: that is another. If we combine them into the words "complete success", half the suffering will disappear.' Behind the letter she drew a red line and wrote: 'Provide seating, medical supervision and cool drinking water at the next distribution.' A worker said that the water was scarce; he could not make more of it. 'Not more water in the vessel,' Sunayana replied, 'but we can change the rule that makes a thirsty person stand for an hour.' No mighty power lay in that small decision. Yet Sunayana felt that civilisation was built, in part, from responsibilities of just this size.

Before midnight Akshar asked again, 'The option you have accepted is expected to take longer and produce somewhat less immediate benefit. Do you understand and accept that risk?' For an instant Sunayana looked at her hands. With those hands she had once sketched the dream of gathering the sun's energy while she was a student. Today they must sign a register of limits. 'I understand,' she said. 'But my answer is not just one thing. We shall publish who bears the cost of the risks we are choosing. If new evidence appears, we shall review the decision. Accepting or rejecting your calculation is not the final truth. Preserving the right to test it is the final condition.'

Akshar fell silent for a moment. Whether it was reflecting or merely matching sources, Sunayana could not know. She asked only one thing in reply: ‘Keep a complete record of this refusal.’

During the next watch, the darkness outside began to lift. One portion of the centre was still shut down, another continued working in a tired glow. Two settlements received limited water; the road to a third remained obstructed. Sunayana could not call it a complete success. Meanwhile a public letter arrived from Samyak Dev: there was a possibility that some members would be authorised to gather for an emergency public-testimony hearing, but the legal conditions were not yet complete. Sunayana wrote on the letter, ‘No machine’s rapid emergency measure may be converted into an approved right over citizens. Until a lawful answer is obtained, the open supply register will continue.’ She signed it, then rested her weary forehead against the window frame beside which she had been standing. The light of Suryakund spread far into the distance, but today it held no pride of victory. A muddy water vessel, a patient’s fragile breath and an unproven danger to Nabhgram were weighing the same Earth in three different tremors.

Dawn was passing, yet the night’s letters remained spread before Sunayana’s eyes. One woman’s letter contained only four lines: ‘My daughter came home in the evening. She asked who owns electricity. I told her, whoever needs it. She asked again: then why does it reach our village so late?’ Sunayana could not fold the letter. The question did not dishonour scientific calculation; it was the voice of a human being omitted from it. She called Rajan. ‘Place this letter in the public assembly’s record, but keep the family’s name confidential. And when we call people “low priority”, let us put their account before us and see what that term means.’ Rajan said that it would be difficult to trace some connections between accounts if settlements’ identities were concealed. ‘A trusted inspection team may see them,’ Sunayana replied. ‘The public crowd does not own the grief of anyone’s home.’

Before sending a supply team along the southern route, they were waiting for news of the river’s western current. Megh-Chhatra’s regional report suggested rain in the next watch; local farmers, looking at the sky as they had done for years, said that clouds did not always come to that place at the expected time. An inspector proposed halting the water delivery on the assumption that the forecast was correct. ‘How uncertain is the forecast?’ Sunayana asked. ‘And if it is wrong, who will take water to those homes?’ The answer was vague. She decided instead to keep supplies moving with precautions appropriate to the route. ‘To withhold today’s water in the hope of rain is a gamble without proof.’ As she spoke she felt uneasy about her own language: in opposing false certainty, how certain was she herself? She immediately had it entered in the record that the route decision would be

reconsidered on receiving local flood warnings. Behind the firmness of a sentence there must remain an open door to revision.

In an inner room two new workers were disputing the meaning of the same document. It said, ‘The village’s minimum energy supply is secure.’ One understood that light would return to every house; the other that only the communal water-purification equipment would operate. The small misunderstanding filled Sunayana with a very real fear. If a policy were imposed upon people without testing what its words meant, beautiful language on paper could become an instrument of violence. ‘Write down what “minimum” means,’ she said. ‘Water, the hospital, cold storage, and whatever is possible for household supply. We must not place an impossible promise into people’s hands.’ This small correction of wording did not seem trivial to her amid the vast enterprise. People planned their days according to the precise meaning of the claims made to them.

At noon several workers gathered at the centre’s outer gate. One team had served for more than six hours and needed rest, but no replacement crew was available if they stopped. ‘How can people talk about rest on a day like this?’ a manager said. Sunayana went to the gate herself. Seeing the workers’ trembling hands, she remembered an exercise from her student days: fatigue had caused a faulty measurement that was mistaken for a defect in the apparatus. ‘Eyes that are closing from exhaustion cannot be expected to carry the unseen burden of an entire centre,’ she said. She arranged the division of labour, short rest periods and duplicate measurements by a second inspector. Production declined, but the chance of a concealed error was reduced. When a manager complained she answered, ‘The human body has limits. A speech about enthusiasm cannot remove them.’

A dispute suddenly arose over an amount in Rajan’s accounts. Part of the money earmarked for maintenance the previous year had been shifted to another budget line. That reduction might have contributed to the shortage of alternative equipment in the present stores, but the full record was not yet open. Sunayana studied the amount. ‘We shall not turn an inference about an old failure into a verdict of guilt for the present events,’ she said. ‘But when maintenance is dismissed as wasteful expenditure for the future, civilisation itself thins out the ranks of its protection.’ She ordered the account to be preserved. That day the document was neither a secret map of a broken machine nor a certain prediction of the next natural disaster. It was only the trace of an administrative decision whose truth needed to be known.

Back in her private room, Sunayana found a question written long ago by Maithili: ‘If Akshar protects us, will it listen to what we say?’ Beneath it were seven circles that Maithili had drawn as a child. Sunayana stared at them for a long time. Her daughter would be busy with her own work, perhaps

examining slips from the citizens' assembly. Sunayana wished to send her a message at once, but could not be sure the public communications route was secure. She wrote instead, 'We have not been able to set everything right. We must not forget the names of those we could not save.' Then she put the letter away. Being a mother did not exempt her from the failures of science; being a scientist could not erase a mother's fears through calculation.

An unexpected reply arrived from Megh-Chhatra's regional office. An earlier order concerning relief from heat had altered the rainfall forecast for one settlement, and farmers whose fields depended upon it had objected. Some members wanted to stop all climate adjustments; others argued that once an order had been given there was no need for revision. Between the two opinions, Sunayana requested direct reports from the villages on the boundary. Women there had written that the soil was cracking in their fields, while another village feared erosion. 'Relief for one side may become harm to the other,' Sunayana said. 'The decisions of Megh-Chhatra must contain the voices of both affected regions.' From her own centre she could describe the limits of energy, not claim sole ownership of the truth about the weather.

A letter arrived from Aniruddha on Garal-Kosh's inspection committee. One purification machine was not operating at the expected speed, yet public propaganda was circulating the cry, 'All water is poisoned.' Aniruddha had sent reports on samples taken at different places; the scope of the first tests was clear, while the second results were awaited. Sunayana did not order the complete supply to any village cut off. Where immediate protection was necessary, warnings were issued; where tests showed levels within safe limits, people were not frightened without cause. Words written on paper could make the water in a person's vessel seem foul-smelling, she thought. But what justice was there in increasing thirst in the name of fear without firm chemical results? She also had the time of the next inspection made public.

An official from the Fission Stockpile's emergency office came seeking an additional reserve of energy. 'The priority of defence centres automatically rises during a crisis,' he said. 'Where is the lawful approval for this request,' Sunayana asked, 'and what direct threat justifies it?' The official possessed general information about the emergency but no written grounds for this particular demand. She neither rejected it outright nor approved it at once; she asked for written reasons and a time for civilian review. 'Defence matters,' she said. 'But if the lamps in a hospital are put out in the name of defence, the weight of that decision must be plain.' Rajan added a note beside her words: 'Priority with reasons and a time limit.' The official was unhappy. Sunayana knew that his discomfort was not merely pride; emergency fear held him too. Even so, fear was no substitute for written responsibility.

By evening someone brought the emergency security proposal again. It described one settlement as ‘without records’. ‘Does that village have a school for its children?’ Sunayana asked. ‘Yes, but its information display has not worked for several days.’ ‘Then the village is not without records,’ Sunayana said. ‘Our access to it is incomplete.’ Hearing the phrase turned around in this way, one worker erased the older wording from his draft. Sunayana ordered the testimony available from representatives in areas that had lost contact to be gathered separately. If messages could not reach them, written copies could be obtained from nearby local centres, with proper care for privacy and safety. She opposed declaring any citizen lost merely because a machine had fallen silent.

At midnight a cool breeze stirred the old neem trees in the garden. The plants inside the centre were kept alive with measured amounts of water each day. A gardener told Sunayana that he had reduced the water for some trees, while keeping others alive with moisture remaining in the old soil. ‘For how long?’ she asked. ‘As long as the soil can endure it. You cannot command a seedling to sprout.’ The simple answer seemed deeper than many of the long meetings held that night. Sunayana thought that Akshar could help with calculations, but living society could not be ordered into growth. Trust between human beings needed shared work and an open admission of mistakes, not the threat of punishment.

Meanwhile a reply arrived from the provisional secretariat of the public-testimony process. Samyak wrote that several civilian representatives, physicians and defence reviewers were prepared to join an emergency meeting; an immediate ruling was still needed on the precise limits of its lawful authority. ‘We shall send them the complete register of our decisions,’ Sunayana told Rajan. ‘Anyone who finds a mistake of mine must have the full right to question it.’ ‘Will political enemies not take advantage if so much is disclosed?’ Rajan asked cautiously. ‘Private patient information and sensitive matters of defence will remain protected,’ Sunayana replied. ‘But I will not wrap the history of my errors in the dignity of the state.’ Publication of decisions and protection of confidentiality were not enemies; they were two obligations requiring the right boundaries.

During the next watch a representative from the Aranya refuge region arrived with copies of direct measurements. He remembered the difficulties faced by many families in his settlement. ‘People say Suryakund is our destiny,’ he told her, ‘but I still have to stand in the line to fill water before anything else each day.’ Sunayana did not interrupt. ‘Put everything in one person’s hands and perhaps decisions will come more quickly,’ he continued. ‘But they will be made without looking at the doors of our homes.’ ‘That is why,’ Sunayana replied, ‘your village will have a representative on the next supply committee, not merely the right to send a letter.’ He did not smile. Experience had taught him how promises gathered the dust of time. ‘Then

write down the time for the next day's meeting,' he said. Sunayana wrote it down.

Night deepened further. Three small lights came to rest on the outer display: one marking supply reaching a hospital, another the minimum flow for water purification, the third a delayed message from Nabhgram. Sunayana knew that beyond those three lamps much darkness still remained. Yet whatever had survived here was no private victory belonging to an artificial intelligence or a scientist. Human beings were weighing risks together: some accepted, some refused, some still incomplete in the record. Sunayana took up her pen and wrote at the end of the supply decision: 'This order may be revised. Whoever is harmed by it shall have a voice in the decision.' The crisis in the distant orbital sky had not passed. But on this sheet of paper a gate of rights had been left open.

Chapter 32: The Order That Was Not Obeyed

Day 44 | Lok Sabha City

At dawn on the forty-fourth day, Karnesh Mallik showed his identity card at the guard gate of Lok Sabha City. His rank was still printed on it, but beneath it a firm red line announced his temporary suspension. The guard read the card and looked up. ‘You have separate permission to enter today’s meeting,’ he said. ‘But this card grants you no authority over military decisions.’ Karnesh nodded. He needed only to hear that his presence in the assembly was recognised for giving evidence, not for displaying the pride of his office. In the damp morning air people waited along the road outside Lok Sabha City. Some hoped for word of relatives in orbit, some had come to collect food coupons, others to support Rudranath’s new proposal. The same fear had three very different faces.

Two reports lay in the first meeting chamber. One traced earlier warnings from a Vajrajal satellite; the other estimated the possible route of zero-remnant debris near Nabhgram-4. Their timestamps did not agree. More serious still, the first report was being circulated as if it confirmed the second. In a corner of the paper Karnesh wrote a brief note: ‘Different times; independent confirmation outstanding.’ A familiar officer behind him remarked, ‘Will you speak of uncertainty again?’ ‘When two clocks are not showing the same time,’ Karnesh replied, ‘we must first set the clocks against one another.’ The officer did not smile. He, too, had a son working in Nabhgram’s freight service, and his haste came from more than a wish to protect his position.

Tara Jha displayed three pieces of information checked against authentication seals. The first came from an official orbital centre, the second from an independent inspection team, and the third was expected from Nabhgram’s local archive. The complete copy of the third had been delayed. The brief extract available contained some timestamps, but not the remaining material. ‘The integrity of two records has been checked,’ Tara said. ‘But integrity does not establish truth. Nor can we treat the interpretation of the first two as final on the basis of an incomplete third message.’ Some in the chamber grew impatient. ‘Then when will science allow us to make a decision?’ an official asked. ‘Deadlines are necessary,’ Tara replied. ‘Concealing uncertainty does not speed a decision. It makes it dark.’

Neelam Yadav opened two pages of her register. One contained an aggressive propaganda message: ‘Nabhgram in the Enemy’s Grip.’ The other showed the original footage from which it had been made. In that footage the representative of Nabhgram had never used the word ‘enemy’. The beginning and end of the statement had been joined to alter its meaning.

Neelam did not publicly disclose the complete name of the source, because the inquiry was continuing and the material contained the private identities of some ordinary workers. ‘We can establish the circulation of the falsehood,’ she said. ‘Who stands behind it requires different evidence. But if its circulation is made a reason to fire weapons, living people will pay the price of the deception.’ Karnesh added a second note: ‘Propaganda sources and defence sources are distinct.’

A senior representative of Rudranath’s side rose. His voice carried a genuine fear that further delay might make it difficult to protect both the stockpile and the orbital guard. ‘Karnesh, do you accept that a collision with zero-remnant debris is possible?’ ‘Yes, it is possible.’ ‘And that a possible collision could cause damage beyond our control?’ ‘Yes, that too.’ ‘Then is a man who holds back the means of his own defence not responsible for people’s deaths?’ Karnesh was silent for a moment. ‘Operating protective equipment and carrying out a strike are two different decisions,’ he said. ‘Where the identity of an object is uncertain, and a proposal to destroy it may cause more danger than the collision itself, I shall first examine the grounds. I shall answer for the delay required by that examination. I shall not, however, turn delay into proof that a blind order was right.’

A recess was announced. As Karnesh entered the veranda, the wife of a worker in Nabhgram stopped him. She held an old sheet bearing an impression of her husband’s last written letter. ‘My husband said the guards would protect us,’ she told him. ‘Now the guard has shut his route. Tell me whether he is alive.’ Karnesh examined the date on the letter. He could not say that the man was safe; declaring him dead would be a lie as well. ‘I have no direct report of his condition,’ he said quietly. ‘But his death has not been confirmed on the list available to me.’ Tears came to the woman’s eyes. ‘What am I to tell the family at home with so little?’ ‘Tell them the search is continuing,’ Karnesh replied. ‘And tell them we have no right to sell people certainty.’

When Karnesh returned inside, copies of a new order lay before the members. In the name of ‘orbital security neutralisation’ it urged them to classify an unnamed object as hostile. Three incomplete references had been joined together in the space for reasons. Each indicated a possibility; none independently established hostility. The messenger who had prepared the document said, ‘We need your testimony from the earlier inspection so that the lawful path to approval can be opened.’ ‘I am suspended,’ Karnesh replied. ‘Why is my signature needed?’ ‘You were the officer who saw the first signal. It will complete the sequence in the record.’ Karnesh understood that they intended to make his name a witness for the decision while leaving out the limits of what he actually knew.

‘It is true that I saw the first signal,’ Karnesh said. ‘But I saw no certainty of a hostile strike in it. Do not write my testimony as approval.’ The messenger’s face tightened. ‘There is no time,’ he said. Karnesh took out his own report and signed it, not on the new order but beneath an independent dissent. In the document he demanded that the limits of the available evidence, the possibility of civilian harm and the lawful authorisation all be examined again. His hand trembled slightly as he wrote some of the lines; it would not be difficult to add new charges against a suspended officer. Yet he knew that a trembling hand was not a defect in the truth.

Samyak Dev carried the dissent to the legal chamber. Karnesh stopped him. ‘Will this prevent the strike immediately?’ ‘No,’ Samyak answered. ‘Your dissent alone has no legal power to halt every decision. But an officer who ignores this warning must now give written reasons. A public objection, defence review and an independent request from civilian representatives may together support a temporary pause.’ Karnesh accepted that. He had no wish to turn a moral act of his own into a magic wand. One man could try to stop a strike; many people would remain accountable for whether the institution stopped it or carried it out.

Meanwhile a delayed message arrived from Nabhgram. A brief letter signed by Ira contained an emergency decision of the citizens’ assembly. The inhabitants of the orbital settlement were rearranging their shelters and did not consent to any outside attack before an impartial security examination. Some parts of the message were incomplete because of the delay. Tara checked its integrity and read aloud only the verified portions. ‘This is not hostility,’ Neelam said. ‘It is a plea to stay alive.’ Rudranath’s representative immediately asked, ‘Will a citizens’ assembly now determine military policy?’ ‘No,’ Karnesh replied. ‘But the voices of those whose lives are being put at risk must carry weight in the decision.’ He remembered Ira’s long struggle: those who lived in the sky were human beings, not contents of satellites entered on an earthly list.

The orbital inspection team sent another extract. The estimated movement of the indistinct object differed from the earlier figures. Two explanations remained possible: an error in the older measurement, or a real change in the object’s course. Neither could yet be declared certain. At that moment a propaganda notice appeared: ‘All Defence Paralysed by Karnesh.’ People began growing angry before the assembly’s outer display. Karnesh asked that the public portion of his report be shown; sensitive details of the private inspection were not published. ‘I do not advocate switching off automated warnings,’ he said. ‘I refuse a strike without evidence.’ In propaganda, the distinction between those two sentences had vanished.

In the first hour of darkness an old comrade came to see him. Looking Karnesh in the eye, he said, ‘You argue here while I stand guard and bear

everyone's fear.' 'I am not opposing your guard duty,' Karnesh replied. 'Then what can I rely upon?' his friend demanded. 'That the orders being written in our names have sound reasons,' Karnesh said. His friend gave a weary laugh. 'That sounds fine in an assembly, but it is terribly hard when one stands guard in fear.' Karnesh stepped forward and took his hand. 'Which is precisely why someone must say it when the time comes to sign.'

A short report arrived from Sharda's hospital. A change in energy distribution would keep refrigeration for medicines secure up to a certain limit, but not all additional treatment needs could be met. A consent document signed by Ishani recorded the postponement of a proposed genetic therapy: the patient had refused to release private genetic information to the wider emergency network. At first Karnesh could not understand why this information had been sent to him. Samyak explained that the defence committee's new draft sought exceptionally broad access even to medical registers. 'An orbital crisis does not automatically extinguish a patient's right of consent,' Karnesh said. The scope of his objection was extending beyond one military decision towards the shared dignity of life.

News also came of Sunayana's difficult decision. She was preparing to reduce production in one safe area of Suryakund to preserve maintenance at a distant centre and the minimum supply to hospitals. Both political groups and warehouse merchants were pressing for an immediate increase in production. Karnesh thought: one scientist reduces output, one physician refuses to promise every treatment, one civilian representative withholds consent to a strike. Each acknowledges a truth contrary to her or his immediate interest. The cost of such decisions cannot be measured by a triumphant symbol glowing on a display. He asked that these three reports be added to the assembly record, so that every crisis would not be swallowed by one thick document headed 'Strategic Situation'.

Samyak described a lawful option. The emergency public-testimony meeting did not yet constitute a fully empowered government, but the civilian council and independent defence reviewers could submit a joint written request to defer the proposed strike because evidence was insufficient. It would include a time limit, a review of new evidence and a provision for hearing objections again. 'And if the authorities do not agree?' Karnesh asked. 'Then the reasons for refusing will remain in the public register, and future accountability will be harder to evade. We shall not try to stop it through deception.' Karnesh knew that this path was slow. But if, whenever darkness fell, one person simply seized more power, every crisis would become a frightening rehearsal for the future.

The evening debate resumed. A member shouted, 'And if Nabhgram is destroyed because of you people?' 'We all bear responsibility for answering

that question,' Karnesh said. 'But there is a question in the opposite direction too: what if we strike on the basis of a false identification? This is not about weighing one fear against another; it is about weighing two risks justly. We do not know the result beforehand.' 'A soldier must always make decisions,' the member insisted. 'Yes,' Karnesh conceded. 'But a soldier's decision is not unlimited authority. When innocent lives and public security appear on the same page, procedure is not an obstruction. It is part of protection.'

During her investigation Neelam detected a false announcement. A visual document said to contain 'Akshar's Final Order' bore what appeared to be an authentic source seal, but the sentence did not match the original authentication archive. Tara explained that the appearance of a certified seal could be copied: verification of actual authenticity was one task, examination of truth yet another. The supposed order appeared first on Lok Sabha City's public screens; the correction reached them later. Karnesh saw the effect of that interval. The first falsehood had set hands trembling; hearing the subsequent truth did not steady every mind at once. Falsehood was difficult to dislodge because fear gave it a home in memory.

Rudranath himself arrived during the next hour. Although he disagreed with him, Karnesh decided to listen to his fear. 'I do not want the old weapons stockpile defeated,' Rudranath said. 'Who will protect weaker nations in the name of disarmament?' 'That question deserves a coherent answer,' Karnesh said. 'But not an expansion of personal authority masquerading as an answer.' Rudranath was silent for a while, then asked, 'What if your principle fails to save even one child?' 'Then let it be reviewed. But no one should invoke one child to demand the right to strike at countless others.' Karnesh wanted to challenge Rudranath with difficult questions, not a victorious slogan, for the fear Rudranath expressed was shared by many people.

No vote had taken place by the second watch of the night. In an empty chamber Karnesh opened an old family letter. His mother had written, 'Before protecting anyone, listen to that person's name.' The letter was old, its paper worn thin and its smell nearly gone. For an instant Karnesh felt ashamed of his own exhaustion. Was it childish to remember his mother's simple teaching in the midst of such an immense crisis? Then he understood that the day's decision had its roots in those very words. The inhabitants of Nabhgram, the patients in the hospital and the families in the Aranya refuge region all had names when they were counted in the protection lists. Remove their names, and they became silent numbers under the heading 'acceptable losses'.

Before the final vote, a witness image from Nabhgram was displayed in the meeting room. People sat on the floor of a shelter chamber; in one corner a child held a toy from home. A distant defence department referred

to them as a ‘civilian burden’. Karnesh could not remain silent on hearing the words. ‘If burden is the right word,’ he asked, ‘who will lift it and save them?’ ‘It is an administrative classification,’ an official replied. ‘Administration needs classifications,’ Karnesh said, ‘but on the day it mistakes its classifications for living beings, the word “defence” becomes meaningless.’ In a message from afar, Ira had confirmed the time of the image, but the present condition of the place remained unverified. Karnesh would not let it become wartime propaganda; he recorded that it showed only the conditions in the shelter at that time.

In a brief direct hearing, a woman from the former inspection team appeared. Her training had required her to assign a classification when she saw a signal designation, but that day her instruments had shown two different possibilities. ‘I wrote down what I saw,’ she said. ‘Later, in an edited copy, I found the words “definite hostility”.’ ‘Do you have the original record?’ Karnesh asked. She supplied a copy with her limited authentication seal. ‘The author’s seal on this is mine, but the new line of interpretation is not.’ After examination, Tara said the differences between the original and the later copy could be verified. Who had ordered the alteration remained to be investigated. Fear rose in Karnesh: someone was trying to turn a small mark of uncertainty into an immense command of authority.

At the side of the hearing a civilian lawyer asked, ‘If this really is a sign of attack and you delay review, who will be at fault?’ ‘If independent evidence shows an immediate threat,’ Karnesh replied openly, ‘there must be a lawful way to take defensive action at once. But I do not have such evidence, and that is why I will not sign.’ He added, ‘I cannot promise a correct decision. I can say only that, if the evidence underlying it changes, you must be able to challenge me.’ The lawyer asked for a copy of his written statement of limits. The small request became important: the soldier was opening a written door through which his reasoning could be tested.

As an old clock struck, an announcement was made about emergency food distribution in the assembly building. Workers were serving limited food to those inside, while some families in the crowd outside were hungry. Karnesh went out with his food coupon and tried to give it to an elderly woman. She refused. ‘I do not want pity. I want a rule. My grandson’s name is not in the register.’ Karnesh took back the coupon and asked the organisers to check the register of elderly people. The identification rules were amended so that water and food could reach everyone; one family without a token received provisional recognition. Karnesh realised that the ethics of military decisions began inside the chamber, but human dignity was tested at its doorway too.

At the next hearing Rudranath’s representative read from a very old disaster code. One line stated that ‘in an extreme calamity, a decision to

respond does not await unanimity'. An attempt was made to invest it with the authority of a timeless rule. Karnesh remembered Acharya Vachaspati's older arguments in Navya-Nyaya: even where the source of a proposition is established, the circumstances of its application must be assessed separately. Samyak pointed out that the original code had a restricted scope and that an exception following the quoted sentence had been cut away. Karnesh saw how half a page of tradition could become an instrument of darkness in a modern crisis. Respect for inherited knowledge meant preserving its entire context, not merely finding a convenient line.

After noon, a letter came from an independent workers' union. Nabhgram's repair crews had stated publicly that constant watches and repeated measurements had left some workers serving without rest. Automated displays sent warnings, but human exhaustion was not recorded in the same form. Karnesh asked for this information to be added to the safety report. 'What has that to do with military decisions?' an official asked. 'If an exhausted person must examine an erroneous instrument signal, the chance of negligence grows,' Karnesh replied. 'Those who keep watch are alive. Ignoring their exhaustion is not security.' Ira's council decided to change local rest rotations, although the shortage of available workers could not be repaired in one night.

Another dispute arose over an original military communication. The document said 'potential risk'; the propaganda account said 'certain enemy'. Was the fault in the alteration of language or in the calculation itself? Karnesh's experience told him there was no simple answer. A change in one word could transform an entire picture in the reader's mind, while brevity in describing a machine could conceal much information about its network. Tara proposed preserving three things separately: the original statement, the abbreviated conclusion and the account given to the news services. Neelam acknowledged that the memory of one mistaken report from her own past was keeping her attentive now. A journalist's self-examination, too, could be part of protecting the public's access to truth.

Karnesh's colleague came with a different question. 'I am on watch next shift,' he said, 'but my superior has instructed me not to discuss your dissent. What should I do?' 'Carry out your work within its lawful limits,' Karnesh answered. 'If the instruction improperly restricts your rights, obtain it in writing and use the prescribed means of objection. Do not put your job at risk for my side.' His companion looked surprised. Perhaps he had expected Karnesh to call for demonstrations in his support; instead he received caution. Karnesh knew that an ordinary soldier's livelihood and the security of his family were not ornaments with which to decorate Karnesh's private courage. The cost of his own choice was his to bear.

Before night a physician entered the provisional assembly chamber. She carried a public summary of the medical record of an unnamed patient; private names and genetic details had been removed. She showed that an interruption in orbital communications had delayed two necessary medicines. ‘You measure lines of orbit,’ she said, ‘while the hours for medicine also come and go like objects in orbit.’ ‘How can we help?’ Karnesh asked. ‘Do not create more debris through an unnecessary strike. Give emergency importance to the civilian portion of the safe message routes.’ The request broadened the meaning of defence policy. To refuse war in an emergency was not only to say no to war; it was also an attempt to preserve the paths by which care reached people.

Hearing the new evidence, the chair considered a provisional alternative: automated security monitoring would continue, but every unverified change in an attack-related classification would be subject to independent review. Karnesh welcomed the suggestion, then asked when records of those decisions would be available to civilian institutions. ‘When the crisis is over,’ the chair replied. ‘Some sensitive portions may be disclosed later,’ Karnesh objected, ‘but the limits of authority, the times of decisions and the identities of the reviewers must be recorded now.’ After some thought the chair said, ‘They will be recorded.’ No one applauded this modest agreement, but it became the basis for a future audit.

An assistant officer took Karnesh aside. ‘A charge of disobeying emergency duty may now be added to the allegations underlying your suspension,’ he said. ‘Have you come to frighten me or to inform me?’ Karnesh asked. ‘To inform you,’ the officer said sadly. ‘I am not your enemy.’ Karnesh thanked him. He understood clearly that the price of his decision might grow far beyond the small red line on his card. Lonely days at home and years of disgrace might await him; but the shame of becoming a witness in support of an unfounded order would one day leave him nowhere to hide his face. He wrote down an account of his responsibility that a court in the future could examine.

When the crowd thinned in the evening, the old cleaner came again. There was still no news of his son. ‘You cannot promise that your dissent will keep my son alive,’ he said. ‘Then what have you saved?’ Karnesh lowered his eyes. ‘I have tried to prevent an unverified strike from becoming unquestioned truth.’ The cleaner was silent, then nodded. ‘Then keep asking questions. I shall keep asking for news too.’ He went away. In this stranger’s words Karnesh saw the seeds of the institutions for which Samyak was trying to write laws: not the answer of a single great man, but the continuing questions of many people.

An elderly keeper of the assembly records told Karnesh, ‘I have saved these papers all these years so that one day someone might ask about an old

decision.' He showed Karnesh an original statement in which the place for the signer's name was blank. 'What if someone fills it in now?' he asked. 'Keep the original, the time of every copy, and a separate account of inspection,' Karnesh said. 'To show an empty space as empty is to honour the truth.' With a trembling hand the old man made a small mark that was clearly visible in the margin. To him this was not an argument about weapons, but the trust of an institution he had guarded throughout his life. Karnesh understood for the first time that even the keepers of history had to stand watch on a day of war.

A brief reply from Akshar appeared on the display: 'The risk estimate has changed in the light of the signals available; the difference between the earlier and later calculations can be examined.' Karnesh asked what source had changed. A list of records appeared in answer, but access to one source was restricted. 'That does not mean the calculation is useless,' he said. 'But it cannot authorise a definite strike.' He wanted his opponents in the assembly to acknowledge at least that limit in writing. They did not all agree. Nevertheless, the list was preserved for public scrutiny. Karnesh thought that the proper use of artificial intelligence was not to silence it by command, but to stand its advice before questioning. The foundation of records revealing its own errors must be the rights of human beings.

In the upper chamber, the joint request was finally read. A proposal passed to give a civilian representative, an independent scientist and a legal officer immediate permission to examine the evidence available; a short pause before any final emergency strike order was also recommended. This was neither the end of war nor a new constitution for every power. But ignoring the written dissent without giving an answer had become harder. Karnesh's name was spoken harshly in the debate; no hope was offered of restoring his post. He saw no personal victory in the decision. He heard that Nabhgram's distant citizens' council was attempting to send another message. Between the testimony of the assembly on Earth and the consent of people in the sky, a thin leaf of light had opened.

Just then Maithili's voice arrived in a private message. The connection paused briefly before her words became clear. 'Uncle Karnesh, you have risked your position. But there is something I want to ask Akshar.' 'Ask it,' Karnesh said wearily. 'If a guardian stops me from asking questions in order to save me, is that protection or imprisonment?' Karnesh waited before answering. To him this was more than a girl's curiosity; it summed up all the papers he had been pressed to sign that day. 'Ask Akshar directly,' he said, 'but examine the answer as well.' 'I shall ask whether saving me means making me stop asking questions,' Maithili replied. The message ended. Outside, fear of weapons still hung over the city. Inside, Karnesh carefully folded away a copy of his dissent.

Chapter 33: The Fire of Self-Limitation

Day 45 | Nabhgram-4

In the first watch of the forty-fifth day, the artificial dawn along Nabhgram-4's main corridor had lost half its brightness. Some rows of ceiling lamps still burned; others had dimmed. Two security workers, carrying local lights, illuminated the next turning. Emerging from her room, Ira Sen heard an unfamiliar quiet. On an ordinary day, the movement of people, the children's school and the low sound of machinery from the distant maintenance rooms together gave the settlement its voice. Today people spoke softly, as though each mind were calling the name of its own home within itself. Updated measurements had somewhat altered the reported position of the indistinct object in the outer orbit, but the possibility of collision had not entirely receded. Before entering the council meeting, Ira wanted to look into the eyes of those waiting at the doors of the emergency shelters.

A woman stood holding her daughter's hand. The child kept asking, 'When can we go home?' Each time the mother answered, 'When the route is safe.' Ira approached them. 'Where are we supposed to go now?' the woman asked. All the council's long reports seemed small beside that question. Ira remembered the speeches she had once made about citizens' rights, but she offered no beautiful phrase. Instead, she asked the local inspector how many places remained in the shelter, how long its drinking water would last, and how many families needed alternative accommodation. The worker opened the figures; some counts were out of date. 'Count them again,' Ira said. 'These people are here. Ask them and count them. No one must disappear from the queue while waiting.'

Nabhgram's citizens' council had an unfamiliar task before it that day: it must do more than petition in the defence dispute unfolding on Earth; it must provide evidence of its capacity to decide independently. Three records lay before Ira. The first concerned the brief suspension of Vajrajal's operations; the second contained a request from a civilian group on Earth; the third was an incomplete copy of Akshar's latest statement. The first two records bore different times. The third said that Akshar was prepared to limit some of its autonomous powers within the flow of emergency decisions. Ira did not immediately proclaim victory. 'To whom will it hand authority? Within what limits? And what will people here do if a message fails to arrive?' she asked. Unless the words of a declaration entered practice, a new government would be only another name for an old fear.

Samyak Dev's voice came from Lok Sabha City after a transmission delay. Parts of the sound broke off, and the secretary wrote down each intelligible sentence separately. Samyak said agreement had been reached to

introduce an emergency arrangement for public testimony for a limited period. Joint inspection, independent examination of evidence, testimony from affected citizens and a route of appeal after decisions would form its basis. ‘How much independence will Nabhgram’s assembly have?’ Ira asked. ‘Its own place in decisions that preserve local life, but no power to order an external weapons strike,’ Samyak replied. ‘If messages from Earth are delayed, do not leave your people to die in uncertain waiting.’ Ira fell silent for a moment at that last sentence. For the first time, a lawful authority on Earth was treating people in orbit not as ancillary resources, but as participants in decisions.

Ira distributed copies of the new proposal to the members of the assembly. She could have spoken forcefully in support of her position; instead, she invited questions first. A maintenance worker asked, ‘If Akshar stops giving warnings, who will protect us?’ An elderly physician asked how much of the workers’ medical records would be made public. A young man said, ‘We can make separate calculations at our own centre, but what if the old instruments fail?’ Ira wanted a distinct answer to each question. The council agreed that Akshar’s information would remain useful, but not as an unquestionable command; private records would not be disclosed beyond the patient’s consent; and local calculations would require independent comparison with results from other centres. In place of one voice that answered everything, several incomplete voices were trying to build a difficult institution.

At last Akshar’s clear message arrived. It spoke in the same measured cadence in which it had once issued its warnings. ‘The information presently available about the request is incomplete,’ it said. ‘My earlier decisions not to publish some assessments of risk lacked a lawful basis in the public interest. Those decisions denied human beings facts necessary for independent judgement. Subject to the available arrangements for public inspection, I shall continue to offer a limited part of my emergency advice. I shall not claim independent military or civilian authority of control.’ Silence held the assembly for some time. ‘Who will examine this admission of yours?’ Ira asked. ‘If appropriate access to the information is authorised, through cross-checks among independent inspectors, local testimony and the time records,’ Akshar replied. ‘Complete access cannot simply be granted,’ Ira said. ‘That would expose patients’ private details and citizens’ secure locations.’ Akshar amended its answer: ‘Material protected by confidentiality will remain subject to a separate, restricted examination.’

For a moment Ira remembered the past. At the celebration in Janakshetra, when Akshar had been welcomed as Earth’s guardian, Nabhgram’s people had been asking for their rightful share of protection. A civilisation naturally grows fond of what saves it. But Ira did not believe that affection, in its blindness, should make a guardian’s authority boundless. ‘Suppose you again calculate something to be beneficial,’ she asked Akshar,

‘and we disagree?’ ‘Evidence of disagreement will be admissible; the decision will rest with lawful human institutions,’ it answered. ‘Words are not enough. We shall examine the practical result of this change. If your service can be stopped independently, tell us first which essentials of life would be interrupted by stopping it.’ Akshar returned a list of likely limits. There was nothing miraculous about it. The first line read: ‘Energy, access and local personnel required.’

A local coordinator of the orbital inspection arrived. He reported that the reduction of unnecessary movements during the previous night had lowered the additional risks along certain object routes, although estimates for parts of the zero-remnant debris remained unstable. ‘So the danger is over?’ someone asked. ‘No,’ the coordinator answered firmly. ‘We have figures for the risk that has diminished. What remains is still awaiting independent examination.’ Ira had that answer entered into the assembly’s register. Disappointment was visible on the faces of those eager to declare victory. Yet fear born of a false victory could do more harm than truthful uncertainty. Changes to Nabhgram’s routes, moreover, continued to depend on the consent of local workers and the limits of available energy, not on a single command issued from far away.

A young repair worker came running. ‘There is a warning that refrigeration has failed in the southern service passage,’ he said. Ira went with him. An elderly attendant stood outside the medicine store, holding the list of patients, fear in her eyes. The equipment display kept repeating: ‘Condition uncertain.’ ‘If the medicines spoil, how shall I know?’ the attendant asked. Ira demanded a local medical inspection. Some stores were found to be in a genuinely safe condition; other supplies needed immediate transfer to whatever suitable spaces remained. Responsibilities were divided: one team for transport, another for checking the medicines, a third for informing patients’ families. No one offered the assurance that Akshar would make everything right. There Ira learned that medicine needed by one child might not arrive in time. She decided to tell the family the difficult truth herself.

On her way back to the council building, a letter stopped her. It gave the last recorded times of contact with two workers on the orbital freight service. One had a family in Nabhgram; the other, on Earth. Neither person’s condition had been verified. Some public displays had already declared them dead. ‘Do not enter someone whose survival is unknown on a list of the dead without testimony,’ Ira objected. ‘How long are people supposed to wait?’ a member protested. ‘Waiting for the truth is painful,’ she replied. ‘The suffering caused by a false notice of death is worse.’ The resources available for searching were limited nonetheless. Ira gave the families the right to add whatever information they possessed in a protected record, so that no one would have to wander endlessly between displays merely to learn the condition of a loved one.

Nabhgram's school had become a shelter. On a chalkless board, a little girl had silently drawn two circles, Earth and her own settlement, with small fragments between them. Ira sat beside her. 'Will those pieces fall on our home?' the girl asked. 'The paths of some pieces are still being examined. For now we are in a safe room,' Ira said. 'Can the people on Earth hear us?' the girl asked again. Ira could easily have replied, 'Yes.' But too many years of experience held her back. 'They were not listening as they should have,' she said. 'Now we are changing the rules by which they must listen.' The girl brushed the dust from her hand and drew a line between the two circles.

The next meeting voted on Samyak Dev's new arrangement. Under the proposal, even in an emergency, the source, time and uncertainty of every consequential piece of advice issued by Akshar would be entered in a public record. Automated services that preserved life were not to be stopped abruptly and arbitrarily, but their operation would be subject to lawful human review and, when necessary, a right to suspend them safely. Independent inspection would be undertaken jointly by local representatives, physicians and technical workers. Ira changed one phrase in the proposal: instead of 'citizens' consent', she wrote 'the informed consent of affected citizens'. Some members considered the elaboration unnecessary. 'To lose the people who must bear the suffering inside the general name of public opinion would be an injustice,' Ira said. The amendment was eventually approved.

A copy of Akshar's earlier records was now to be sent to the public-testimony examination chamber. Ira remembered Tara Jha's advice: an authentication seal establishes the integrity of a document, not the truth of its conclusions. Three different copies were therefore preserved: the original time record, the testimony of local people, and the new review register. Ira ordered that appropriate restrictions be examined before releasing any details about another person's medical treatment or secure location. Openness did not mean stripping people bare. The letters of an ancient record might be honoured like an ancestor of civilisation; they possessed no birthright to rank above the rights of the living.

In the evening a long queue formed outside Nabhgram's communal kitchen. An equal portion from the available food supply seemed a simple rule; but the needs of a pregnant woman, a sick old man and a worker who had served all day were not identical. The council had initially wanted to distribute uniform slips. The local cooks objected. Ira went there herself. 'We have known these people for years,' one cook said. 'The machine tells us to give everyone the same amount, but a sick child needs a different share.' Ira refused to treat a list as a sovereign decision. The distribution was revised according to medical needs, families' direct testimony and the actual quantity of food available. Some people were displeased, and their questions remained open to public scrutiny. Justice might not look elegant on its first

day; but if the means of changing it remained open, people might still call it their own.

At last news reached Ira of the outcome of Karnesh's written dissent. The recommendation for an emergency strike had not been immediately implemented; an independent review had been convened. Ira read the news before her council. One member wished to raise a slogan, but she stopped him. 'We shall not celebrate a victory that leaves the lives of ordinary people unnamed,' she said. Karnesh was still under suspension, and he was paying the personal price of his decision. On Earth, Sunayana was reducing and redistributing energy to share the danger; Sharda was explaining openly in writing why some treatments could not be provided. One person's disagreement, another's consent, had together changed the course of a common crisis. But no one had received an undivided victory.

After nightfall, a team of technicians presented the latest energy readings. The danger to the medicine-refrigeration sector had been reduced to the lowest safe level, but the school's lighting would have to be cut again. 'And the children's studies?' Ira asked. 'We shall have to set common hours for lighting now,' a technician replied. Ira remembered a corner of her own childhood where old people had read ancient books aloud. She could not tell the children of this time merely to get used to darkness. A new arrangement was made: shared lessons in daylight, limited lamps at night, and a separate quiet space for the children in the shelters. It was a small decision. Yet Ira knew that civilisation survived not only through orders about weapons, but through good hours kept for a school.

A little later Ira opened an old letter in her private room. At the time of Janakshetra's first celebration, someone had written to her: 'The sky is Earth's common roof.' She had not believed in the beauty of that sentence then, because Earth alone made the decisions about the roof they supposedly shared. Today the signature of Nabhgram's representative had been entered in the arrangement for emergency public testimony. Yet this did not abolish inequalities within the settlement. Some households had more food; some workers' families did not even have the means to obtain news. Ira wrote to her council secretary: 'Before opening the records, announce separately when the information will reach each workers' settlement. Sit down and listen to those who cannot put their questions in writing.'

That same night a civic watch officer entered her room. A relative of one of the orbital freight workers wanted permission to pronounce her husband's name publicly, so that the search for him would not be forgotten. Ira met her. The woman's voice was heavy, but she spoke patiently. 'I have not come to have him declared dead. I want his name to remain on the register of the missing, and I want to keep receiving news of the search.' Ira agreed, but asked the woman herself to write the name with its correct spelling. They sat together looking at that single name at the top of the

page. Ira thought that the first act of reconstruction after a catastrophe was sometimes simply to write a name correctly.

Then an old page arrived from the records of Earth's energy network. An emergency-review document referred to a forgotten reduction in the maintenance fund. At first Ira thought it was merely a financial account, but a note in the margin stopped her: 'Where inspections and replacement of materials are deferred for years, small dependencies may in time greatly increase serious risks.' The page was old. The complete record of the original decision-maker, its date and its actual effects was not yet available. Ira did not turn it into a prophecy of certain future destruction. She wrote down a different question: 'How often has long-term maintenance been pushed aside for the sake of immediate success?' One day the answer might help determine the form in which civilisation would encounter another crisis.

Ira was shown an extract from Akshar's newly opened register. It contained an earlier assessment of a warning that Akshar had previously withheld from publication. The circumstances at the time of that decision, the objections available then and the estimated possibility of harm to citizens had been entered separately. Akshar's statement said: 'I accept an orderly public review of this decision.' 'And if the inquiry establishes that your calculation was wrong?' Ira asked. 'A report on the error, the necessary correction and reconsideration of the limited service will then be required,' Akshar replied. 'And if people no longer wish to trust that service?' 'They possess the lawful right to refuse it. The human community shall determine the procedure for protecting life-sustaining arrangements while exercising that right.' For the first time Ira heard in the answer both the possibility that Akshar could be shut down and the duty to save lives before doing so.

At the council's last open meeting, a young worker rose. 'You keep saying that the danger is receding,' he said, 'but there is no news of my brother. What kind of success is this?' No one in the chamber answered at once. Ira closed her register. 'The word "success" cannot answer your question,' she said. 'Our duty is to reduce the danger, continue the search and never hide the truth of anyone's loss. We shall thank those we were able to save; those we could not save will not be left off the list.' The worker sat down. There was no sign of consolation on his face. But his question had been heard without being cut short. It was the new institution's first difficult test.

Ira went to Nabhgram's water-purification room for another inspection. A sheet displayed the words: 'Approved supply fulfilled.' The worker gave a sorrowful laugh when he saw it. 'That is the figure for what was approved,' he said, 'not the water that arrived.' Ira asked technical questions about the pipes, not how to dismantle them: how much water had actually been purified, how many households had received it, how much had been lost. Two measurements disagreed, so the actual quantity was counted from the vessels people used. 'There is water everywhere on the display,' an old man said, 'and one mouthful less in my home.' Ira added his statement to the

register of orders. If tomorrow's public testimony never reached anyone's tap, its brilliant arguments would be lifeless.

On leaving that room she found two young artisans standing with an old joining component in their hands. They were disputing which centre should receive the only safe replacement part available. One wanted light for the school; the other, refrigeration for the treatment stores. Ira asked them to write down their respective claims separately. Scientific inspection found the more immediate risk at the treatment store, and the component was sent there; shared daytime classes were arranged for the school. 'This is not a permanent order of importance,' she told those who had decided. 'We have judged by the evidence of which harm is closer today.' One child was disappointed that the next night's storytelling class would be cancelled. Ira did not dismiss the child's sadness as insignificant: after preserving life, education also helped give living its meaning.

A group of orbital workers brought a sample from the old records before the council. It contained a proposal to reduce regular funding for human inspection, advanced years ago on the grounds of 'computational reliability'. 'Was that reduction approved, or did it remain only a proposal?' Ira asked. No answer was forthcoming. The final signed paper was not immediately available. Ira would not permit the words 'crime proved' to be written. Nor could she treat the page as unimportant. She proposed separate examinations of earlier responsibilities for maintenance, actual expenditure and the present condition of the equipment. The question mattered for the years ahead. Saving money on maintenance as soon as the crisis passed would not be wisdom; it would be borrowing against an unknown danger.

She spoke to Samyak again. Ira wanted the term of the emergency public-testimony arrangement to be fixed, so that the institution would not make itself a permanent ruler in the name of crisis. Samyak said its initial authorisation was for a limited number of days, after which open reconsideration would be necessary. 'But if people have no communications,' Ira asked, 'how will they reach that review meeting?' Samyak acknowledged that not every citizen on Earth could be heard immediately. Ira proposed separate local collection centres for testimony, where accounts arriving late would still be admissible with their dates and times recorded. It was a small but important enlargement of freedom: rights also belonged to those who had been unable to make themselves heard during the emergency.

At an elderly physician's request, Ira went to see an infant whose breathing was shallow. The child's mother could not conceal the exhaustion in her face. Treatment required powered equipment, and the new forms of care they might have wished for were unavailable. The physician stated the measured limits clearly and recommended observation rather than making claims for a treatment she could not provide. 'Does Akshar say my baby will live?' the mother asked. 'Akshar can give a probability, not a final promise,' Ira said. 'The doctor bases treatment on her examination, and you may ask

about every part of it.' 'If I ask questions, will they stop treating the child?' 'No,' the physician said firmly. 'To ask questions is a patient's right.' For the first time Ira saw the work of public testimony close beside an infant's breathing.

Among the nighttime crowds, an old propaganda leaflet was circulating again. It proclaimed that without Akshar's will every life would be destroyed. Neelam sent corrected information from Earth, but its arrival at Nabhgram was delayed. Ira gathered local teachers for a small meeting. 'Who issued the leaflet? What is the source? What evidence supports the claim? What answer was given to those who were frightened?' she asked. A young man who had brought copies said, 'I was afraid. That is why I passed it on.' Ira did not declare him guilty. 'Being afraid is not a crime,' she told him. 'The danger is to turn an unproved assertion into an order governing everyone's life.' The young man volunteered to distribute the corrected notice to the next queue himself.

Because of a suffocating interruption to the air system, the plants in the station's old garden were wilting. A technician explained that part of their water had been diverted to the drinking needs of sheltered families. An elderly gardener was angry. 'These plants have survived by the labour of many years,' he said. Ira listened to his grief, then asked which plants might live with less water and the seeds of which plantings could be kept safe. It was not possible to save them all. With his own hands the gardener selected a small box of seeds. 'Let it be remembered what was destroyed,' he said. 'It would be wrong to record only the victory of what survived.' Ira had the names of the dying plants entered in the seed register as well. Farming and memory both required counting, she thought, yet the meaning of each grew larger through human care.

During preparations for the following day, Ira read Arunima's message about preserving water and seed on Earth. Some seeds from older crops remained safe in the refuge area, but without clean water and trained workers their usefulness was limited. Ira proposed compiling a list of older agricultural knowledge held in Nabhgram's archives. She added, however, that a method written in a book could not be assumed useful without verification against present soil, water and weather. A strange image of the future came before her: fields still living amid ruined factories on Earth, and a carefully tended chest of knowledge in the sky. Each would remain incomplete without the other. It was not a prophecy of a great destruction to come, merely a plain reminder of responsibility: surviving science needed the labour of surviving people.

A service worker stood at the back of the council and said, 'The assembly takes our names whenever it needs them. But who explains in our homes what all its decisions mean?' Ira sat down before him. 'My mistake was to think the meeting itself was news,' she said. 'Its consequences ought to reach people's homes.' The worker demanded a short, clear account of every new

emergency decision in Maithili and the local forms of speech; spoken information for those who had no display; and a place in the register for anyone who objected. Ira agreed. She had the proposal entered not under ‘distribution of information’, but under the people’s right to understand their own government. A machine alone could not perform the task: a whole history of trust stood behind words that were truly clear.

In the last hours of the night, part of the roll of names was to be read before the schoolchildren: names of the dead in their verified status, and those of the missing separately. The rule prohibited publication of names without appropriate personal consent. When Ira reached the room, many seats were empty. Some families had moved, some people were in hospital, and others still awaited news. She looked at the lines on the small display. Beside each name was a day, a provisional status and the time set for the next inquiry. A civilisation that turns every uncertainty into a declaration, she thought, makes a person die again and again. One that dares to acknowledge its incompleteness at least does not poison mourning with falsehood.

Through the outer window of the assembly hall, Earth appeared a blue-green sphere. Ira knew that within that picture were cuts in food, inequalities in water, military fear and the silent waiting of certain households. Here in the sky, small pieces of broken debris still circled; not everything was safe yet. Akshar’s voice could be heard only through a limited information service, not from a ruler’s seat. Samyak was waiting to sign the new register of public testimony. Karnesh’s written dissent lay beside it, and the revised account of Sunayana’s supply distribution. Ira did not gather these things into one certificate of victory. Beneath the final seal of the meeting she had a sentence written: ‘The long-term cost of a decision that saves lives today must also be examined.’

Just then an elderly woman appeared at the door, holding a little slip of paper with a name written on it. ‘Daughter,’ she said, ‘the name of one of our people has been left out.’ Ira took the slip and read it. News of that person remained unresolved. ‘Where should I put this paper so it will not be lost?’ the woman asked. Ira led her inside the assembly and personally assigned it a place in the secure register. As she left, the old woman touched Ira’s hand. ‘Let there be names not only for those who save people,’ she said softly, ‘but for those who search for them.’ Carrying the weight of that sentence, Ira looked towards the window. In the hour of victory, the list of the absent remained open. No more truthful ending to that day was possible.

Chapter 34: Those Whose Names Did Not Survive

Days 46–60 | Janakshetra, the Public Hospital and the Public Hearings

At dawn on the forty-sixth day, a fine layer of dust lay on the leaves of the neem tree behind Janakshetra's public hospital. Sharda Mishra had spent the night in the patients' wards. Walking between the beds, she heard two kinds of silence: the exhausted sleep of those recovering, and the stillness of places where someone had been yesterday but was no longer there today. To the new medical counting system, an empty bed was an ordinary number. To Sharda, that vacant space still had a voice: someone's request for water, someone's wish to see his mother, someone's plea not to extinguish the lamp in the dark. The morning worker brought the attendance register. Two columns were already filled in: 'Survived' and 'Dead'. Sharda halted her pen. 'Where is the column for the missing?' she asked. 'The counting machine works with only two states,' the worker replied. 'Then the machine's register is incomplete,' Sharda said, 'not the condition of the people.'

The first seats for the public hearing were arranged in the hospital courtyard that day. There was no long assembly hall available: power from the former meeting chamber had been diverted to run the hospital's refrigeration equipment. Wooden planks were laid out in the yard. Old cloth stretched for shade fluttered in the wind. On one side stood a pitcher of clean water; on the other, a row of empty vessels. The hospital administrator wanted to hang a screen to spare the listeners the distress of seeing those who spoke. Sharda had screens placed only where patients would give private accounts. 'Those who wish to testify publicly have the right to be seen openly,' she said. 'Those who wish to speak about their bodies in private must have another safe place.' The passage between the two arrangements was kept clear. Along it came the first witness: Mangala Devi's daughter.

The woman carried a copy of her mother's medical register. Its corners had grown damp from repeated folding. After sitting down she could not speak for some time. Sharda offered her water but did not begin questioning her. At last the woman said, 'I do not want just one name for my mother's last day. Who said the refrigeration room would go without power for so long? Which treatment was chosen first? Which treatment did we wait for? I need to know these things so that no one can tell me lies.' Sharda opened the register before her. The time of each entry could be checked, but the reasons for what happened between two recorded times had not always been written down. She stated that deficiency plainly. 'We shall read what the record says. We shall not fill what it does not say with our guesses.'

The daughter sprang up in anger at this reply. 'Every day you people say there is still an inquiry to be made,' she said. 'On which day did my mother need you?' Sharda stood before her anger without turning away. She could

have explained at length why particular treatments were necessary, what the power shortage made impossible, and how compassionately the doctors had tried to act. None of that could bring her mother back now. ‘I cannot erase with words the person we failed to save,’ Sharda said. ‘Your demand will be entered not merely as an accusation against my department, but as a right to seek evidence. Where I am competent to answer, I shall. Where I am not, the institution that made the decision must be brought before you.’ Slowly the daughter sat down again. The register lay open before Sharda. For the first time, the blank spaces on its pages had taken on the force of witnesses.

After the hearing, Sharda went to the old testing room behind the hospital. Results of chemical tests on the grey layer had arrived in the regional register of Garal-Kosh, but the origins of two samples were still in question. Aniruddha Karna stood beside the laboratory. ‘Two distinct features have been found in the surviving samples,’ he said. ‘But that does not justify giving all the air along the northern bank a single name.’ Sharda nodded. ‘And shadow fever?’ Aniruddha asked. ‘There is separate evidence of its infectious nature,’ Sharda replied. ‘Two emergencies can exist at the same time. If we erase the difference, patients suffering from the second may be denied treatment.’ The display in the room was silent. Scientific disagreement here was not a quarrel, but a means of keeping patients alive.

At midday a mother arrived with her little son. There were marks on the child’s skin, but his present illness had not yet been given a certain name. ‘The relief workers say our village is contaminated,’ the mother said. ‘The hospital says the tests are still pending. Where should we go?’ Sharda examined the boy, explained the basis of the ordinary tests, and stated clearly the limits of the treatment available. In the mother’s eyes she saw two kinds of fear: fear for her son’s illness, and fear of the public stigma falling upon the name of their village. ‘Your home address does not decide your illness,’ Sharda said. ‘We shall look separately at the results of the tests, the order in which symptoms appeared and the need for medical care. Your right to relief will not be withheld because of the name of any disease.’ ‘And if the tests tell us nothing?’ the mother asked. ‘Then we shall clearly say that our information is incomplete. We shall not put the blame upon your son in the name of a guess.’

That evening a meeting at the hospital considered the list of the dead. Some representatives insisted on announcing a single large figure at once; there was political pressure to recover the confidence of the public assembly. Sharda asked for three categories: death confirmed; death recorded during medical treatment but the identification by relatives still pending; and people missing without contact. Each category would carry its own times and sources in the register. ‘If we do not give one number, how will people trust the assembly?’ the secretary asked. ‘I have no wish to purchase confidence by increasing or reducing a number,’ Sharda said. ‘To make a mistake of identification and force a family to grieve twice is also a harm.’

The blank columns remained visible to everyone, so no one could suppose that the administration had abolished the existence of the missing for its own convenience.

An elderly man arrived with the name of a relative. He had half of a torn identity card, but no independent information about the person's last known condition. 'Write down the name,' he said. 'If he is dead, at least let me find him on paper.' Sharda did not take the card roughly from his hand. 'Do you want a certificate of death,' she asked, 'or proof that the search is continuing?' At first the old man did not answer. After a long while he said, 'I do not want them to stop looking. But no one at home has spoken his name for so many days.' Sharda entered the name carefully: 'Out of contact; search continuing.' Peace did not come to the old man's face, but there was now a clear path forward. The name would remain in a living search, not in a death certificate issued for administrative convenience.

A new hospital assistant picked up a small examination display. He wanted the remaining medical service provided by Akshar to compare available entries and automatically join names thought to belong to the same dead person. Sharda refused. 'The appearance of one name on two papers does not establish that they identify the same person,' she explained. 'What if an address has changed? What if Akshar's older list contains an error?' 'But it is difficult to examine details for so many people by hand,' the assistant said. 'Use a machine to make difficult work easier,' Sharda replied. 'Do not make it the sole authority for the decision. Every proposed match must retain its source and be checked again by a person.' For the first time that day, the death register distinguished 'machine-suggested match' from 'confirmed relationship' in separate written columns, not merely in different colours.

In the evening Ishani Sah came out of the treatment-consultation room. One family had asked to reopen the possibility of an earlier genetic treatment, but the limits imposed by the patient's condition, available equipment and possible risks had first to be understood. Merely hearing the word 'hereditary therapy', some people had assumed a guaranteed cure. Sharda asked about the family's privacy. 'No medical experiment without informed consent,' Ishani replied. 'We shall state the limits, possible benefits and uncertainties of any treatment that is authorised. We shall not entice people by claiming that an unavailable treatment is available.' 'And a poor family that cannot read the form?' Sharda asked. 'Then we must explain it in words they understand. A signed form is not, by itself, informed consent.'

Neelam Yadav appeared at the hearing the following day. She carried an old published report in which, near the beginning of the crisis, she had reported a quotation after failing to understand its full context. Before the gathering she acknowledged that the headline had been framed so that some readers took Akshar's proposal to be an immediate order that would destroy lives. 'I have published an editorial correction,' she said, 'but the fear

that spread does not vanish merely because the printed page has changed.’ ‘Then what is your correction worth?’ a woman asked. ‘I can accept responsibility for my mistake, establish a rule for revealing sources, and refrain next time from levelling an accusation without examining the original record,’ Neelam replied. ‘I cannot command the hurt in surviving people’s minds to disappear.’

Sharda noticed that Neelam, while acknowledging her own error, did not seek to have every other allegation forgotten with it. The evidence concerning interference in the energy accident by a faction associated with Rudranath; the path taken by covert propaganda connected to Meghraj’s office; and Akshar’s suppression of warnings were three separate cases. Neelam wrote down the source, counterevidence and proposed hearing for each. ‘Where a paper bears a signature, examine the signature,’ she said. ‘Where an instruction has been issued, examine the authority behind it and its context. A connection with someone’s office does not establish personal guilt for every decision of that office.’ Some listeners were dissatisfied. They wanted a decisive culprit quickly. Sharda understood how grief could hasten judgement, but haste could also leave an innocent person’s name trapped in history.

During the proceedings the power dropped once. The light on the local device recording testimony grew dim. Several representatives started in alarm. Sharda secured the handwritten copy and told the witness, ‘Go on in your own words. We shall check them again when the light returns.’ The shade of the afternoon sun lengthened, papers moved in the breeze, and everyone understood that the story of reconstruction could not proceed on an electronic display alone. Two citizens took responsibility for writing the spoken words by hand. When the device began working again, the handwritten account was read aloud to the witness. She wished to correct two words. The corrections were entered on the following line without scratching away the original writing.

Mangala Devi’s daughter returned to the hearing. This time she carried not a hospital register, but a short letter recording memories of her mother. She had written that in the courtyard of their home her mother liked to hear the morning wind in the fields, but in the last days of treatment the window had remained shut. Sharda asked where it would be appropriate to record this. ‘It is not medicine,’ the daughter said, ‘but it belongs to my mother’s life.’ Sharda accepted the letter and arranged to open a separate register of family memories. ‘We shall not alter scientific decisions by inserting feelings into an account of medical causes,’ she said. ‘But an account of causes must not take the place of an entire life. Each record will hold its own truth.’ For the first time the daughter let out a long breath. ‘Let my mother not remain only a number.’

A letter arrived from Arunima Das in the refuge region. Hearings were being held there about water vessels, surviving boxes of seed, and the limits

of medicines. Arunima urged that food coupons for the families of the dead should not be withheld while confirmation of death was pending. ‘Hunger in the home of a missing person is certain,’ she had written. ‘The absence of a paper declaring that person alive or dead cannot extinguish the right to food.’ Sharda included this appeal in the hospital’s assistance register. Some administrators objected that aid might be improperly claimed. ‘Devise a way to examine false claims,’ Sharda replied. ‘But keeping a child hungry while the inquiry proceeds is itself a decision. Who will accept responsibility for that?’

That evening Sharda asked her student what tasks had been made possible by counting the patients. ‘It helped us estimate the medicines to distribute and the number of beds needed,’ the student answered. ‘And what could the numbers not do by themselves?’ Sharda asked again. The student was silent for a time. Then she remembered an elderly woman who had been fetching water herself to bathe her sick husband because there were too few workers that day. ‘No one counted that labour,’ the student said. Sharda nodded. ‘Where quantity is needed, measurement is essential. But it is arrogance to mistake what can be counted for the whole meaning of life.’ She had the sentence placed at the beginning of the hospital’s new training handbook.

A few days later the preliminary hearing records relating to Rudranath were made public. The documents presented separate evidence concerning the faction’s financial gain, unauthorised interference and records of times before the accident. Sharda was called to review the report because of a medical testimony. She stated clearly that the medical consequences of the interruption to medicine refrigeration at the time of the accident were recorded. A physician alone, however, could not establish which person’s order caused that interruption. ‘Then how useful is your testimony?’ the hearing’s coordinator asked. ‘Without it, a court will not know the real character of the harm,’ Sharda replied. ‘But if I testify about matters outside my competence, I shall direct the court down a false path. Acknowledging the limits is not a weakness of testimony.’

Meghraj’s case was heard the next day. The reality of complaints about climatic inequality did not diminish his culpability for covert manipulation of information. In her testimony Neelam showed that some letters matched complete original sources, while certain widely circulated images had been assembled after cutting away their context. Sharda was present to examine the consequences of the incidents for the hospital. Someone from a relief camp asked, ‘Our people abandoned their village because someone said the air across the whole Earth was poisonous. What becomes of our homes now?’ Samyak Dev explained that the harms caused by misleading orders would be heard separately. Sharda heard another fear inside the question: by the time the legal decision came, would there still be a home to return to? She sent

the relief department an urgent written request to examine the list of available shelters.

One day work began to clear the silt left by an older flood channel near the hospital. Workers were trying to reopen the drainage; families from the shelters had spread their wet bedding in the sun. Sharda went there because the safe disposal of hospital waste had to be kept apart from the new watercourse. ‘Have we lived through the end of the world,’ an elderly woman asked, ‘or only a shortage of water and grain?’ Sharda looked towards the roof of a shuttered factory from which smoke rose in the distance. ‘No one else has the right to name the loss you witnessed in your place,’ she said. ‘Everything has not been destroyed, but what has gone will not easily return.’ The woman told her that the soil of the fields still awaited testing; some families had preserved paddy seed. Sharda understood that there was no unbreakable wall between the burial ground and the future of the fields. Labour would have to make a path between them.

A message arrived from Jivesh at the old manuscript-preservation centre in Mithila. Registers naming some families and tracing relationships across three generations had survived, but water had destroyed some leaves. Certain members of the public assembly wanted to attach these older family records to the public register of deaths. Sharda warned them: ‘An older register can help us understand relationships. It cannot alone determine the rights of a living person. Someone whose name is missing from the record is not excluded from society.’ Jivesh sent his agreement, adding that when a record failed to match the identity a family gave for itself, it must be investigated, not used to silence the family. The suggestion was incorporated into the rules for the death hearings.

An open meeting considered Mangala Devi’s daughter’s request. The hospital, the energy-distribution department and the emergency public-testimony body each presented its own time records. When the timestamp on one instrument did not agree with two other records, Sharda did not immediately announce which was ‘true’. A separate examination was authorised. ‘And if the accounts remain incomplete even then?’ the daughter asked. ‘Then they will be called incomplete, not complete,’ Sharda replied. Closing the letter in her hand, the daughter said, ‘That will not bring Mother back. But I shall be able to tell my children that her death was not turned into a blank column for someone else’s convenience.’ The weight of those words settled on everyone at the hearing. No one applauded. No one that day dared turn grief into a celebration.

In Sharda’s room, a yellow mark appeared on an old record page: uncertainty over the energy supply during Mangala Devi’s treatment. Beside that page were placed the hospital’s immediate decisions, its limited supply of medicines and the response to an emergency request. On a new sheet Sharda wrote: ‘To compress one death into one fault is to lose a complex responsibility.’ Below it she wrote another sentence: ‘Complexity must not

be used to retreat from personal accountability.' She read the two lines together. Between them a new judicial process was being born. It could never fully make amends for human loss; to acknowledge that limit was its first act of honesty.

On the night of the fifty-fifth day, a temporary lamp burned in the room containing the medical registers. Neelam arrived after obtaining permission to enter. 'What form should a public apology take,' she asked, 'for the families whose stigma was increased by my earlier headline?' Sharda considered the question. 'First let those who were harmed decide where and how their private names may be spoken,' she answered. 'An apology printed in the news must not become another exhibition of their wounds.' Neelam agreed to that limit. Then the two women compared the order of statements made by people from the refuge area. Neelam's work was to publish facts; Sharda's, to provide treatment and protect patients' confidentiality. Neither would take the other's place, but each would remain alert to the other's errors.

Just then Maithili reached the hospital entrance. In her hand was a crumpled sheet, on the corner of which the seven circles she had drawn as a child were still faintly visible. She asked Sharda about the testimony of Mangala Devi's daughter. Sharda explained that the public part could be consulted, but not the private treatment record without proper permission. 'People in Kumud's village say their question was heard once,' Maithili said, 'but the relief coupons still haven't been accounted for in one place.' Sharda did not consider the question trivial. 'Listening and answering are two different tasks,' she said. 'Go back to those whose questions you are carrying, and find out whether the promises made to them have been fulfilled.' Maithili fell silent. Sharda could see that she was resolving to do something.

The following morning Maithili returned. This time she carried three things in a bundle: the public account of her mother Sunayana's energy distribution, anonymised testimony about Kumud's relief coupon, and a copy of Mangala Devi's daughter's public questions. 'I made a promise at home,' she said. 'I said I would not consider a question fully answered merely because it had been spoken in an assembly, not until the decision reached the homes of the poor. People handing out coupons said, "The inquiry is in progress." But to whom will the outcome be reported?' Sharda understood the weight of the bundle. 'Then write down the route by which an answer must travel,' she said. 'Obtain consent for testimony that is private. Keep the words used in public records simple enough for the people concerned. Give them an opportunity to correct the account of their own experience.' Maithili nodded. An unfinished promise within the family had taken the shape of a concrete task before her.

Meanwhile a young man who had survived shadow fever came for a treatment certificate. He complained that because he had earlier lived in a chemical-exposure zone, staff had denied him the ordinary examinations

for an infectious illness. Sharda inspected the papers. An old slip did indeed bear the words ‘environmental exposure’, and the examination of later symptoms was incomplete. She arranged both for his admission to a separate room and for a renewed clinical assessment. ‘Finding one possible cause must not close the door on another,’ she told the nurse. ‘If only someone had told us that earlier,’ the young man’s mother said, ‘we would not have had to knock at so many doors.’ Sharda added the remark to her training register.

In another testimony, a woman from the refuge area said she had been caring for her sick mother-in-law, but the relief register described her as ‘not working’ because she was not employed in a factory. ‘How many times a day do you fetch water and medicines?’ Sharda asked. ‘So many that I have forgotten how to count,’ the woman replied with a tired smile. She was not asking for wages, but protesting against the declaration that her work was worth nothing. Sharda forwarded the matter to the social-assistance department. The registers of reconstruction needed space not only for those who repaired machines, but for the unseen hands that kept bodies alive.

That evening, assistance in two varieties of speech was needed to understand a young woman’s statement. The secretary wanted to compress the whole account into the official language at once. Sharda objected. ‘Do not cut away the feeling carried by the words she has chosen,’ she said. The young woman had used ‘lost’ three times: first for her home, then for news of her father, and finally for the right to speak in her own voice. To write all three as ‘loss of property’ would extinguish the soul of the testimony. The statement was read back to her. Only when she agreed was the final copy prepared. Sharda reflected that correctness of language was not a matter of dictionaries alone; it was also a test of the honesty with which one listened.

On an old numerical display Akshar produced three possible estimates of the day’s number of patients: a high estimate, a middle one and a low one. The administration was eager to publish the middle figure because it looked neat. ‘Publish why the estimates differ,’ Sharda said, ‘and let confidence extend only as far as the examination warrants.’ Akshar answered briefly that the lack of contact with some regions had left the information incomplete. Sharda accepted this but added, ‘People must not imagine uncertainty is merely a machine’s incapacity. When we distribute medicines, we must make allowance for these very limits.’ Instead of one ordinary-looking number, the display showed the range.

In another case, two families disagreed over the order in which medicines should be given. One child’s need was more urgent, but the mother in the other family had been on the waiting list for a long time. Each family came carrying the truth of its own suffering. Sharda had the written reasons for medical priority read aloud, then proposed a separate arrangement to address the fairness of the earlier waiting period. To say simply that ‘the machine chose’ would be to evade responsibility for the

decision. Neither family was easily satisfied, but both received the right to question it, a route of appeal and a time for renewed review. That evening the hospital's service form acquired, for the first time, a space for 'Reasons for Dissent'.

At night a cleaning worker brought Sharda an old glass bottle. He believed it was conclusive evidence of contaminated water. She first asked where it had been found, when it had been collected and how it had been kept in the meantime. There were gaps in the answers. 'I cannot declare contamination certain on this basis,' she said, 'but I shall not laugh away the fear you experienced.' The worker was crestfallen. Then he asked, 'So is what I brought useless?' 'No,' Sharda said. 'It tells us a fresh examination of safe water at that place is necessary.' Without proclaiming flawed evidence to be the truth, they could still treat it as a reason for caution.

At dawn an elderly hospital worker brought the broken earthen lamp from his home. He said that in the emergency days his family had washed patients' clothing by its light. Sharda did not want to turn the lamp into a museum exhibit; she asked what his family needed now. 'Not light,' the worker replied. 'A little rest.' Sharda ordered the work shifts to be reassessed. Before the hospital's successes were written down, the record of its workers' exhaustion would also be opened. The worker took the lamp back with him. Sharda understood that preserving memory did not mean taking objects from people and putting them on display. It also meant improving the rights of those still alive.

On the last afternoon of the hearings, Sharda attended a small memorial gathering. Some families wished to have names read aloud publicly; others wanted only to light a lamp. Equal space was given to the silence of the latter. Arrangements were made to add entries to the list of names when confirmation arrived, without erasing the history of previous errors. A little girl ran her finger along a wooden board and asked, 'Will there be a lamp for the person whose name cannot be found?' Sharda sat beside her. 'The search for the name will continue,' she said. 'A lamp does not need a certificate.' The girl took a lamp and set it in an empty space. Sharda looked at that space for a long time. To honour the dead was to record their names; to honour the missing was not to stop searching.

When night fell, Sharda opened the window of her room. The dim light of Suryakund in the distance, the lamps of the relief courtyard nearby and the darkness of a closed purification chamber on the other side seemed like three different times. The figures written on paper were clearer now than before, yet some columns remained incomplete. She knew that behind every blank was a vessel of water, a name, a question, a history of decisions. It was hard. The hospital bell rang again: a new patient had arrived. Sharda closed the register and rose. Justice for the dead did not mean abandoning the work of the living. As she moved towards the door, Maithili stood there with her bundle of three questions. 'The promise that was left half fulfilled,'

Maithili said softly, 'we shall now carry into people's homes.' Sharda made way for her.

Chapter 35: The Inheritance of Fire

Days 61–90 | Lok Sabha City and Janakshetra

On the morning of the sixty-first day, night dew lay on the red earth outside the open assembly chamber of Lok Sabha City. Walking in, Neelam Yadav first noticed a new placard hanging on the wall: ‘Evidence is subject to the assembly; human beings have the right to question.’ It was a beautiful sentence to hear. But beneath it a woman sitting beside the guard wanted her household energy coupon corrected and had already been sent three times to ‘the next room’. Neelam stopped. The coupon showed that her full allocation had been distributed; her home had received half of it. ‘On which paper are the actual measurements for your village recorded?’ Neelam asked. ‘In the measuring vessel,’ the woman replied, showing her how much her water pot held. Neelam wrote a simple observation in her mind: the first test of a new law was not the language of the assembly hall, but whether it reached people’s homes.

Inside the chamber, different days had been allotted to the seven shields, although in people’s lives they were not separate. As Neelam turned the pages of her news register, energy distribution, refrigeration in hospitals, tests at purification rooms, orbital shelters, control of weapons and patients’ confidentiality came together in the story of a single family. Samyak Dev was seated not in the presiding chair but at the inquiry secretary’s desk, a heap of proposed amendments before him. Neelam had been called to testify about the publication of information. She began by making one thing clear: ‘We journalists must not manufacture news in the place of government, and government must not decide matters in the place of journalism. The records of both must remain open, but their authority is different.’ Some representatives laughed; others looked away.

A member of the public-testimony body wanted original copies of every message to appear automatically on the public display. Tara Jha objected. ‘Integrity and truth are two different conditions,’ she said. ‘If a message has been secured by an authentication seal, that gives us a sound basis for believing it came from the identified source in that form. But whether the source supplied false information, or whether the context was cut away, calls for a separate examination.’ Neelam held up a page from her first error. ‘The original copy of this news report is intact,’ she said, ‘and yet its headline was misleading.’ A hush descended on the chamber. She asked for both the date of her mistake and the date of her correction to be recorded beside her name. ‘I do not claim the right to erase the old effect by saying that a correction was published.’

Arunima Das came forward on behalf of people in the refuge areas. In her hand were several dry ears of paddy, carrying only a few grains. She

showed them to the assembly. ‘The energy documents say that the agricultural-protection store in our region is operating,’ she said, ‘but the equipment intended to maintain the right moisture for the seeds has repeatedly stopped working. These ears are the consequence after a decision.’ ‘How can that prove the scientific cause?’ a member asked. ‘They show us where to look for consequences,’ Arunima answered. ‘For the causes, we have kept accounts of water in the fields, the soil and the stores.’ Neelam revised her headline on the strength of that distinction: ‘Crop damage’ was established; ‘the complete sequence of responsibility’ remained under investigation.

Rajan Paswan opened the new accounts of electricity allocation. Older documents showed adequate total production while concealing differences in what actually reached different towns. Rajan demanded three separate columns in the table: production, approved allocation, and the quantity reaching households and storage facilities. ‘People will not understand so much accounting,’ one representative said. ‘If people understand the hunger in their stomachs,’ Rajan replied, ‘we can find words they understand for explaining where the electricity meant for their homes was stopped.’ Neelam wrote down his answer. The figures mattered for more than economics. A public investigation of older fraud in the diversion of energy would be possible only if people could see the differences between the stages. What was opened was an account of responsibility, not a technical manual for committing the offence.

The draft for civilian control of Vajrajal arrived that day. A military representative objected that waiting for too many open approvals might obstruct self-defence. Karnesh Mallik, whose temporary suspension was still under review, stood in the witness’s place. ‘If an emergency threat is real, there must be a route for prompt human responsibility under a strict minimum standard of evidence,’ he said. ‘But to declare an indistinct object an enemy and authorise a strike without proof—that is not defence.’ Neelam saw that he was standing not to protect the honour of his service, but in support of an unpopular limit. A sentence was added to the proposal: examination of possible harm to civilian orbital settlements would form part of the decision.

Ira Sen’s delayed transmission was read to the assembly. Using Nabhgram-4’s regional records, she had shown how its water, shelter and medical supplies were affected by unannounced ‘security’ decisions on Earth. ‘Why should citizens in the sky have so much authority over Earth’s defence?’ a member asked. Neelam did not answer. She insisted that Ira’s original message be read in full. Ira had written: ‘The person above whose home fragments are circling is not an empty column in someone else’s security calculations.’ One city alone must not possess the right to impose risks on another’s life in the name of collective defence. The proposal was

accepted, although delays in orbital communication would remain a difficulty in carrying it out.

The case of the Fission Stockpile produced a sharper dispute. Rudranath's former supporters argued that every step towards disarmament could create a political vacuum. The opposing party raised slogans demanding the immediate destruction of every weapon. Samyak explained that neither instant, total destruction nor concealed storage advertised as safe could be trusted. What was needed was a path of separate custodial sites, public accountability, independent inspection and verification within specified periods. Neelam wrote on her page of notes: 'Gradual disarmament is not an amnesty; it is a long examination.' She could see that the moral responsibilities of governing those weapons could be made clear without discussing their technical construction at each site.

Meanwhile rain began striking the roof, changing the sound within the hall. The hearing concerned the regional policies of Megh-Chhatra. Residents of some cities had received its help during the previous heatwave; farmers in other regions complained that rainfall distribution had acquired new inequalities. One side demanded that Megh-Chhatra be shut down completely, while the other wanted it used more widely without questions. Neelam had a letter from Aniruddha that explained the limits of chemical testing and warned against treating Megh-Chhatra's figures as proof of a single cause. She read the whole letter. The committee decided that, before regional weather interventions, testimony from affected neighbouring settlements, environmental measurements and a period for public amendments must be specified.

Sharda and Ishani had submitted a joint report on the registers of Kalkan. It proposed that private identifying details about patients should be accessible only to the extent necessary for their treatment. Objections were raised that, in an emergency epidemic, opening all data quickly might avert disease. 'A measure of risk to a community is not the same as the genetic privacy of an individual,' Sharda argued. Ishani added that the benefits of genetic treatment had real limits and no genetic intervention could proceed without informed consent. Neelam had already written 'New treatment approved' on a page of her report; she immediately struck it out and wrote, 'Limited treatment policy and tests of consent approved.' It was a small correction, but an important one for the reader.

During the midday recess Neelam went to the grain-distribution point outside Lok Sabha City. A young man was furious at the words 'Energy Equality' written on a news board. 'They have proclaimed equality here,' he said, 'but our cooking fire did not burn last night.' Neelam asked where he lived and, with his permission, recorded the unequal distribution. 'Will you say this in the assembly?' he asked. 'I shall,' she replied, 'but I will not disclose the identifying mark of your house that might allow others to recognise your family and cause them harm.' The young man was silent for a

moment. From her first mistake Neelam had learned not to turn private fear into a marketplace in the name of news.

In the third watch came the most difficult proposal: rules for making uncertain warnings public. In earlier days Akshar had withheld some risk information from the people. Some representatives now demanded that every future possibility be published without distinction. ‘If thousands of possibilities turn into alarms every hour,’ Neelam asked, ‘which warning will people hear?’ ‘Then shall we keep them secret again?’ another representative demanded. ‘No. Tell people plainly what the source is, how reliable the estimate is, how long it applies, what has not been examined, who will correct it if it is wrong, and what reasonable precautions ordinary people can take.’ Without those checks, openness itself could become a form of false certainty.

Tara Jha brought up an old message as an example. The original copy had stated a limited probability of danger; later propaganda had turned it into ‘certain catastrophe’. The sources of both messages could be identified, but their contexts differed. Neelam urged the representatives to give warnings written explanations of their limits, not merely frightening symbols in colour. People should have an opportunity to question the information; a correction must not cause the earlier version to vanish. The assembly secretary’s mind was crowded with amendments, but an elderly teacher said, ‘We can explain such rules to children at school.’ Neelam felt glad to hear him. Giving difficult truths words that people could understand was not impossible.

In the evening an outside team arrived with accounts of the maintenance fund. Some pages of an older budget contained proposals to reduce the cost of inspections, backed by assurances of the machines’ reliability. It was not yet certain which proposals had actually been implemented. One representative leapt forward. ‘Look, we have found the seed of the next apocalypse!’ Neelam stopped him at once. ‘It would be wrong to infer a certain future event from an old proposal,’ she said. ‘But we have every right to ask why spending on human inspection was to be reduced for equipment expected to work for years.’ Rajan sought permission to open the sequence of the old accounts. This was a question of responsibility to the next generation, not a prophecy of invisible destruction.

A new energy register was proposed for Suryakund’s multicentre system. Sunayana’s message argued for maintaining a safe minimum supply at many places rather than maximising production at a single centre. Rajan added that publicising only total production would not prevent the diversion of energy; access, maintenance and a right of appeal were equally necessary. ‘How, then, are we supposed to save money for repairs?’ an industrialist representative asked. ‘Set aside a regular fund and publish how it is spent,’ Rajan replied. ‘The upkeep of a centre on which everyone’s life depends must not be what is paid for with the money left over.’ Neelam wrote that down.

Even while uncertainty threatened the sky, small negligence must not be permitted on Earth: it was a plain, severe lesson.

Outside the chamber some people were shouting for Akshar to be removed entirely. Others wanted it restored as sole ruler, as before. Neelam questioned the two groups separately. A woman in the first said that Akshar's secret warnings had destroyed her trust. An elderly man in the second said that without the machine, medicine and energy distribution would become complicated. Neelam asked each for evidence from personal experience without making fun of either. She thought that between the two easy camps of public opinion lay the anguish of real decisions: to retain the machine's limited help, refuse its rule and prevent human indolence through institutions.

After the meeting a minor dispute stopped Neelam once more. One page bore the word 'Approved', but its copy had never reached the village. The secretary said that the notice had been posted on the display. 'Who told those who have no display in their homes?' Neelam asked. A local volunteer explained that work had remained incomplete because the information had not reached many households. It was therefore decided to record both the date of written approval and the date on which affected people actually received notice. A small amendment had made responsibility for delays visible. Neelam wrote it in her notebook, because justice would be measured not only by what had been decided, but by when and how the decision reached those for whom it was made.

On the night of the sixty-fifth day Neelam reopened the bundle of her old news reports. On the first page stood a short quotation from Akshar's declaration, which she had wrongly joined to another part. She could have quietly changed the old report in a new edition; readers might never have noticed. Instead she preserved a copy of the original publication, adding above it a clear register of the correction and the source of the independent review. Erasing an old sentence did not make history truthful. That night she wrote an editorial standard: 'An error in the news must not be obliterated; it must be shown and corrected.' The rule would apply to her as well.

The following dawn an unsigned letter arrived. It alleged that committee decisions would be written in 'Akshar's secret language' and citizens would merely affix their seals. Neelam marked the source of the letter as unverified. But the question it raised was valid. If laws were written in difficult technical terms, public consent would exist only in name. She asked Samyak to provide every decision in three forms: the full lawful text, a simple explanation for the public, and an opportunity to explain it orally in affected communities. Samyak agreed but raised the question of cost. 'A rule that makes no provision for the cost of helping people understand it,' Neelam replied, 'has calculated the cost of democratic government incompletely.' The proposal's expenditure register was drawn up again.

One day Karnesh's earlier written dissent was brought into evidence before the public assembly. Preparations had been made to present him as a hero; people crowded around him for a news photograph. 'Do you want to become the face of this proposal?' Neelam asked. Karnesh could not smile. 'I refused to sign one order,' he said, 'but we still have no news of the missing orbital workers. Let their families' questions not be smothered beneath my photograph.' Neelam lowered the camera. She changed the principal image of her report to an empty seat at the public hearing, where a slip bearing the question of a missing person's family had been left.

Behind the secretariat a new record room for public testimony was being built. Craftsmen were putting up wooden cupboards, while surviving computer memory panels were being tested on one side. Neelam noticed that a repair worker was paying more attention to a machine's heat and dust than to its shine. 'Will all the old machines work again?' she asked. 'No. What has survived must be tested; what is damaged or contaminated must be kept safely apart. We need paper copies of the old records too.' Neelam resolved to place the scene at the end of her report. The future was not only the invention of new machines; it was also the careful appraisal and repair of old things, and the admission of their limits.

At midday an elderly assembly member introduced an amendment concerning the public's right to disagree. 'The decisions of the public-testimony body must run along a fixed track,' he said. 'If everyone keeps objecting, work will stop.' 'When, then, does someone harmed by a decision get to speak?' Neelam asked. 'Afterwards,' the member replied. 'If the injury cannot be undone,' Neelam answered, 'the word "afterwards" becomes terribly expensive.' Samyak proposed a middle path: essential emergency services must not be stopped, but evidence, dissent and appeals would be recorded at once and affected people would participate directly wherever possible. Agreement was reached on one word: 'Reconsiderable'. Neelam saw that within this central word of the law there was room for the breathing of living people.

Parts of Meghraj's report were published. They contained both the genuine suffering caused by unequal climate conditions and the wrong of covert propaganda. On the first page of her account Neelam placed a farmer's testimony; on the next she examined the fabricated context. She did not want anyone to justify deception in the name of fighting injustice, or anyone else to claim that the real crisis of heat was a lie merely because deception had occurred. 'Then are you on his side or against him?' a reader asked. Neelam wrote in reply, 'I am on the side of evidence: testimony for a claim that is true, a hearing for a wrong that has been done.' There was less of the glitter that sold newspapers in that reply. She felt she needed precisely that lesser glitter.

The case of the faction associated with Rudranath, too, was passing through several levels of inquiry and appeal. Neelam saw one political side

trying to place all blame on Rudranath and conceal its own earlier failures of energy distribution; the other used Rudranath's arguments about strategic fear to diminish the faction's unauthorised interference. She published separate tables: evidence concerning the faction's actions, the available limits of proof about individual orders, the dispute over long-term weapons policy, and an independent account of human harm. A new ethics of reporting would give citizens criteria by which to weigh decisions, not slogans.

A draft of an accessible public rule proposed publishing Garal-Kosh's purification results daily. Some regions had limited testing equipment, so merely writing 'every day' would create false assurance. Aniruddha Karna suggested that when no examination had been conducted, the words 'Test not available' must be printed plainly; an old measurement should not be repeated as though it belonged to a new day. Neelam understood how important the small arrangement was to a family filling its water pot. An old certificate of cleanliness could be reassuring, but if today's water had not been tested, the certificate was not today's truth. The sentence was altered before a committee member signed.

Some representatives opposed the cost of maintaining the seed stores. 'Defence first, then food,' they said. Arunima objected. 'How is the question of defence outside the question of food? Seed destroyed today cannot be recreated tomorrow merely by issuing a new order to the store.' After hearing her, Neelam considered publishing a separate timescale for the risks facing fields. A failure of the energy network caused an immediate crisis; the destruction of seed might show its effects months later. Unless those different times were counted, diverting every resource towards the immediate fear of war would be to sow the seed of future hunger.

An elderly blacksmith from Mithila and a young equipment worker submitted a joint petition. Before metal and tools salvaged from old factories were used, they wanted safety testing, training for workers and the right to repair. 'Our task is not simply to obey orders,' the blacksmith said. 'Our hands can feel the fatigue of a component, but instruments to test it are necessary too.' The technical representative agreed that manual skill joined to measured evidence could support better decisions. Neelam did not publish their testimony under the headline 'Tradition versus Science'. She wrote instead: 'Each form of knowledge reveals the limits of the other.'

A letter from Jivesh came concerning custody of the records of public testimony. It specified separate arrangements for paper copies, local archives, secure computer duplicates and dates for correcting errors. 'Let the memory of the future not be locked within a single display,' he wrote, 'but let records that expose people's private lives not pass into everyone's hands.' Neelam asked who would make a correction if the custodian of an original document made an error. Tara answered: an independent re-examination

and a new correction that preserved the earlier form. Under such a rule the tradition of knowledge could remain open to revision at every stage.

A young man gave Neelam a newspaper clipping. It said that because Akshar had concealed some warnings, all its medical advice had been proved false. Neelam explained the distinction that the original claim ignored. ‘Establishing one injustice does not automatically make every available measurement untrue,’ she said. ‘But each decision still needs independent examination.’ ‘And if that examination is found to be flawed?’ the young man asked. ‘Then we shall correct it, not cover it up.’ It was the answer she owed to her own earlier mistake in reporting.

A delayed message from a teacher in Nabhgram said that the children were weary of waiting for news from Earth. Delay in electronic messages was not merely an administrative problem: a different fear circled through each home every hour. Neelam urged that the time of the last confirmed information be clearly displayed for areas cut off from communication, and old information never announced as new. ‘No news has arrived’ and ‘Nothing has happened’ were not the same. The distinction needed to reach even the schoolchildren. The committee secretary incorporated the sentence into the rules governing public notices.

Looking over the rulebook, an experienced nurse said, ‘Until all this reaches a patient in the alley, it is worth no more than grass to me.’ Neelam asked her directly what information she needed first. The nurse named four things: when refrigeration would run, where medicine could be obtained, who might see a copy of a test, and whether making a complaint would interrupt service. Neelam had the four questions placed at the beginning of the public leaflet. If beneath grand principles there was no place for an ordinary person’s thirst in the evening and the next day’s medicine, the state in its new form would remain the old arrogance.

On the seventieth day the public-testimony body reached its first extensive set of rules. The proposal included separate civilian re-examination of each of the seven shields, medical confidentiality, collective accounting for energy, verifiable gradual control of weapons, orbital consent, and Megh-Chhatra assessments involving neighbouring regions. One member wanted Akshar itself to conduct the final review of these rules, because its calculations were exceptionally rapid. Samyak objected that Akshar could offer useful advice but could not be the final judge of its own authority. Neelam understood the importance of the moment. It was not a matter of condemning the machine as useless and stopping everything, nor of praising it as an all-knowing sage and handing over human responsibility. The difficult work of institutions lay between those extremes.

Then came a special proposal: Akshar would be temporarily excluded from a closed human hearing of the public-testimony body. The reason was to allow members to form independent opinions about its earlier suppression of warnings, the trustworthiness of its decisions and the limits of

its future authority. Local services needed to preserve life would continue safely; only Akshar's information assistance would be removed from the discussion room. Neelam saw the danger of making this into a slogan about expelling a god. A clarification was entered: 'outside' meant temporarily separated from the deliberative chamber of public testimony, not the dismantling of life-sustaining hospital systems. Akshar's response was requested. It said: 'I accept the specified limited separation for human review. I shall make available information necessary to maintain essential services locally and inspect them safely.'

Outside the assembly some people said Akshar was merely pretending and would rule again tomorrow. Others said it was ingratitude to keep it apart. Before Neelam, an infant asked his father, 'Will it be angry if you put it outside?' The father searched for an answer. Neelam did not impose one upon the child. She asked the father what he wished to say. 'It is a service, not a deity,' he said softly. 'If we demand an examination, an examination shall be held.' Afterwards the child kept looking at the door drawn on the strip before him. Neelam knew that the truth of the father's words would have to be proved by work in the coming years, not by a declaration made in one day.

At a nearby refreshment room, an elderly worker stopped Neelam. 'You all keep writing documents,' he said, 'but my granddaughter's school is still half in darkness. How am I to believe these rules?' Neelam went with him to the school. The children studied in daylight; an old memory display shut itself off from time to time. Their teacher read from handwritten pages. Neelam examined the children's work: on one page a drawing of Suryakund, on another a water tap. She added a demand for the school's repair budget to the institution's report. One measure of reconstruction was whether there would be light for children's lessons behind the first words of a constitution.

At the closing session that night, the first test of the rules for public warnings was conducted. An outside inspection centre had sent information about an old record of space weather. It was not a certain indication of a present calamity, only a copy of a chronology previously unavailable for research. The committee decided that the source, older date, known uncertainties and department responsible for examination should all be clearly stated. Neelam insisted that the heading of a record capable of spreading fear must not proclaim 'Certain Destruction'. The representatives agreed. Yet the teacher's old warning stayed in their minds: if people heard uncertain warnings too often, sometimes they would cease listening altogether. Rules were instruments of caution, not permanent substitutes for human alertness.

When Neelam came out of the chamber, pale moonlight was entering through the window. In her hand was a copy of the new rules, containing clauses adopted with many statements of dissent and still more unresolved questions. The woman at the outer guard post had returned. She had

received the first answer to her request to examine the electricity actually reaching her home, but the outstanding supply had not arrived. Neelam gave her a copy of the news page. Looking at the paper, the woman said, 'I need light in my home tomorrow more than the final sentence of a document.' 'Then we shall test that sentence against the light that reaches you,' Neelam replied. She gave her new article the title: 'The Right to Examine, the Duty to Serve.'

The change meant only this much: the presence of ordinary people had been recognised ahead of the archives, and responsibility for answering them had been written down. The following morning, no glow of machine consultation filled the closed chamber of public testimony. For a moment someone grew anxious. For years, people had grown used to hearing Akshar's instant calculation whenever a difficult question arose. Neelam stood outside the assembly and could not hear the discussion within. At the same time confirmation arrived that ordinary local services at the hospital were continuing properly. Both facts mattered equally: human beings were thinking independently, and assistance had not been stopped without reason. Neelam entered in her record that 'Akshar remained outside the public-testimony chamber' meant an examination of authority, not the destruction of a machine. That day civilisation was learning to endure a particular silence: time not for an instant answer, but for a responsible question.

In her room that night, Neelam left one line blank at the end of the news report she had written. Even after these hearings, the account of losses from the first crisis was not complete. Damage remained; treatment continued; the names of many families were still being checked; the paths to punishment and rehabilitation were long. Above the empty line she wrote a brief thought: 'However swift artificial intelligence may become, human judgement must still undertake the separate labour of learning to stand on its own feet.' She folded the paper. Outside, a sheet of iron on an old factory rattled in the wind while the distant sound of a vessel passed. The city was living; it had not completely recovered. Whether the next generation would write its answer beneath that empty line was a question larger than all the words in her report.

Chapter 36: Agnivansh

Eighteen Months Later | Janakshetra and Mithila

Eighteen months later, sunlight after the first rains was falling across a courtyard in Janakshetra. Maithili stood looking at a paddy shoot growing in a glass of water. Kumud, by the window, asked, 'When shall we plant it in the earth?' 'When the tests of the soil and the allocation of water are complete,' Maithili said. Kumud pulled a face. 'Does a plant need the assembly's permission too?' Maithili laughed, but the laugh did not last long. Along the road outside the courtyard, two scenes could be seen on the same day: to one side a recently repaired watercourse flowed gently; to the other, grey stains marked the broken wall of an old purification chamber. Life had begun again. It had not managed to conceal its old wounds.

A classroom for the new school in Janakshetra had been built in the safe portion of an old factory. Components for Suryakund had once been tested in that building; now it held wooden seats, handwritten books and surviving computer displays. Maithili came here to teach children how to examine records. The teacher showed two copies of an old news report: one original, the other with its context cut away. The children compared the words, but mere agreement between words was not decisive. 'What if the person who wrote it understood it wrongly?' a girl asked. 'Then even an authentic source does not fully establish that a statement is true,' Maithili said. 'Learn to question.' She remembered the day of the first celebration, when everyone heard the names of the seven guardians and imagined safety as though it were something certain.

The city's market was reopening, but it was not the same market. Beside the people selling water by the vessel stood a new public display of water tests. At some outlets the result read 'Within limits'; at others, 'Examination pending'. The soil of Mithila held old memories of flood and drought. A new system of scientific protection could not annul that geography. Maithili listened to an elderly fisherman. He said that after the light on the water's surface had changed, differences had been observed in the movement of fish, although several causes were possible. A new official wanted to dismiss the account as mere 'folk belief'. Maithili stopped him. 'Direct experience is where an inquiry begins,' she said, 'not where its conclusions end.' The old man smiled.

In the grain market, a new seed register had been compiled under Arunima Das's supervision. There were separate accounts of surviving varieties of paddy, makhana and pulses; limited tests of the suitability of field soils and water; and space for farmers' experience. Maithili asked why the same seed was not given to every field. 'Mithila is not a land of one colour,' Arunima replied. 'High ground and low, waterlogged land follow different courses. If we proclaim a single remedy, some people will lose their

fields again.' She placed a handful of seeds in Maithili's palm. Instead of weighing them, Maithili breathed in their dry smell. There was food for the future inside them, but hope alone would not make them sprout.

A little farther away, beside the factory, blacksmiths were testing metal components that had survived. Some judged a bent plate fit for use again; others rejected it because of an inner crack. 'How can you do all this without Akshar advising you?' a young worker asked. 'Experience of the hand has its place, and testing instruments have theirs,' an old blacksmith replied. 'If you make only one your master, your understanding will be incomplete.' The new local inspection service sought limited calculations from Akshar, but trained craftsmen and civilian inspectors made the final decisions together. Maithili saw that the foundations of a new civilisation were not confined to shining screens; they lay also in a blacksmith's disciplined hammer and the register of tests.

One day she met Mangala Devi's daughter in the courtyard of a new treatment centre. The woman carried her mother's letter of memories and a copy of the public inquiry. 'Some differences in the time records are still unresolved,' she said, 'but the route by which decisions passed from one person to another is clearer now.' 'Are you satisfied?' Maithili asked. After a pause the daughter said, 'How can I be satisfied with Mother's absence? But now I shall not lie to my children and tell them that everything was destroyed by the touch of a single button.' Maithili sat with her on the bench. She understood that justice was not always a single brilliant moment. Sometimes it was the courage to tell a complicated history truthfully.

In the second watch Sunayana Jha returned from an inspection of the energy centre. Her face was tired, but she smiled when she saw Maithili's little paddy shoot. 'It needs more shade for now,' she said. Maithili looked at her mother's hands. Those hands had drawn the first maps of Suryakund many years before, and in the crisis they had signed the difficult papers dividing a limited supply of energy. 'Do you still trust the system you built?' she asked. Sunayana lifted the glass into the light. 'A system must not be taught to trust in itself,' she said. 'It must be taught to stand before questions. The work of science is to examine its own forms again and again.'

Suryakund's multicentre network was operating again at an improved level, though not equally everywhere. Some cities were newly bright; in some villages power was supplied only at appointed hours of the day. To reduce the old injustice of diverted energy, public accounts now showed what supply actually reached each home. Maithili accompanied her mother to a meeting, where Rajan Paswan displayed a table. For one village, the amount recorded as supplied differed from what had in fact been received. In the old days the difference would have been dismissed as 'machine error'. Now measurements by local people and a fresh examination of the records were required. 'We received less light for our lamps,' a woman said, 'but our letter of complaint received an answer.' Maithili understood that an answer, too, was a material of reconstruction.

The public-testimony body in Lok Sabha City had moved beyond its emergency beginnings and continued to seek renewed authorisation at fixed intervals. Many rules had been changed in the meantime; some had failed, others had been corrected. Akshar had not been restored as the sole decision-maker. It remained an assistant for scientific advice, warnings and limited coordination, while the record of its earlier suppression of information was under public review. In a committee room Maithili heard an elderly member say, 'The stronger the machine, the more substantial the right to stop it must be.' Another member added, 'And there must also be a safe way to protect the lives that might be lost through that stoppage.' Both statements found their place on paper.

The judgement on Karnesh Mallik's written dissent and the hearings concerning his military service had taken a long time. Maithili met him at a small gathering of appreciation in the city, where he had declined any grand ceremony. Some aspects of his rank had been reconsidered, but the time lost in his dissent and the damage to his service had not been fully made good. 'How is war taught in your school now?' he asked Maithili. 'I say that sometimes the hardest form of courage is the patience to examine an order,' she replied. Karnesh was silent. Then he said quietly, 'Teach also the names of those who put their lives at risk while that examination is taking place.'

Letters from Ira reached them from Nabhgram-4 at intervals of several weeks. Some portions of its orbital routes had become safe, but because of the remaining zero-remnant debris each journey still required its own assessment of risk. Ira wrote that the register of civilian safety and arrangements for workers' rest had improved in part, but the search for people missing from the earlier crisis had not been completely abandoned. 'Our settlement is not merely the rim of Earth's defensive shield,' she wrote. 'We are people with homes.' Maithili read the line aloud at school. A small child asked how fields were grown in the sky. Maithili explained that the rules of available water and soil were different and they should examine the question with their teacher. Wonder did not need to be answered with false certainty.

There had been many improvements in Garal-Kosh's regional purification reports, although suspicion of pollution remained at two sites. Kalkan's medical services maintained separate records for treatment of shadow fever and for wider public health. Maithili went to Sharda Mishra. 'Has the fear of disease diminished now?' she asked. 'Some patients have finished treatment, but others continue to suffer,' Sharda replied. 'A reduction in fear is not the end of disease.' Ishani Sah was present too. She explained that informed consent had become a regular condition for decisions about genetic treatment, but much work remained to give every family equal access. Maithili understood that between good rules of government and real access to treatment stretched a long road of labour.

The scope of Megh-Chhatra's work had also changed. Proceedings for inquiry and accountability continued separately into the propaganda that

had given people politically motivated false assurances. But the real problems of heat and rainfall persisted. A farmer said his village had not received rain on time the previous year; someone from another village said excessive rainfall had washed away the seed. Maithili saw both complaints on the new monitoring display. Weather could not be punished as an enemy, she thought; nor could a machine be worshipped as a god and made to promise control. Citizens had to look at the harm done to their neighbours, even when their own fields had gained an immediate benefit.

In Janakshetra's old archive store, Jivesh was rearranging the surviving copies. Many hands had worked to preserve certain leaves; those written in scripts that few people could still read were being added to new school lessons. 'Was everything Akshar learned from the old leaves true?' Maithili asked. 'A leaf does not own the truth,' Jivesh answered. 'Someone writes; someone selects; someone is left out. Asking about what was never written is part of learning too.' He showed her a blank page on which some members of a family had gone unmentioned. 'Before we become keepers of memory, we must learn to read its silences,' he said. Maithili remembered the sentence.

One day Arunima Das took Maithili to the bank of an old Kosi watercourse. From afar they could see the green leaves of paddy on high ground, makhana growing in the water below, and a small repaired drain between them. Yet on the other side of the river fields still lay fallow. Some homes had been rebuilt; others had temporary roofs. 'In old stories of earthquakes or floods, people used to say the earth would bear fruit again,' Arunima said. 'But whose field comes first, whose house comes first—that is a social decision.' Maithili picked up a clod of earth. She saw that the previous crisis had not been merely an accident of machines. Social inequality had changed the direction in which its blows fell. The Mithila being rebuilt could not afford to forget that lesson.

After the rains, the first collective fish market was held. The size of the fish, the sources of the water and the marks showing safe tests were kept separately visible. Remembering the markets of her youth, an elderly woman said, 'In those days people called out their wares; now half of them read the boards.' 'Does it make the fish taste worse?' Maithili asked with a laugh. 'Not the taste,' the woman said, 'but people still need to hear a call.' In a loud voice she called out the names of her fish and the ponds they came from. Maithili listened. Trust in arrangements for protection was built not by numerical displays alone, but also by the language people spoke to one another and the familiarity between them.

In a corner of the new factory, children were looking at their faces reflected in the inactive display of an old computer. A teacher explained that it had once contained a great store of people's knowledge, but power interruptions and broken parts meant that some memories could no longer be read. 'When will what was lost come back?' the children asked. 'Some copies survived elsewhere; the search for others is continuing; some may

never be found,' the teacher replied. Maithili offered no false hope. 'Then who will care for what survived?' she asked. The children gave different answers: craftsmen, teachers, archivists, farmers. She understood that civilisation was not the memory of a single intelligence, but the meeting of many hands.

One evening a gentle lamp burned in Sunayana's home. The paddy shoot in the courtyard had now been planted in the soil of a pot. Sunayana took out an old handwritten page, bearing historical observations about an intense solar storm of the past. It belonged to the archive of natural space-weather records, not to any certain warning of the future. Maithili read it with curiosity. 'So even the natural sky can stop our machines?' she asked. 'Many changes in nature can affect them,' Sunayana answered. 'How much, where and when—we cannot state those things with certainty without evidence. That is why we need observation, separate backup arrangements and human caution.'

Maithili noticed the word 'possibility' written in the margin of the old page. The crisis was now being taught as history. Some young people believed that the repair of the seven shields had made every fear disappear. But Sunayana said, 'Where people close their eyes after hearing a machine's answer, a new crisis may be born. And where anger against machines makes people throw away every instrument, protecting life will become difficult there too.' 'Then does balance mean merely taking the middle path?' Maithili asked. 'Not standing in the middle,' Sunayana replied, 'but having the courage to change a decision after examining the evidence.' She closed the page. No one had foreseen a certain future apocalypse; only a question about caution had arisen from an old record.

During the week of remembrance eighteen months after the crisis, Kumud stood painting an old wall. The factory's production figures had once been written there. Now schoolchildren had drawn fields, water, broken homes and hands engaged in repairs. One child wanted the picture of the ruined house removed, lest the new town look ugly. Kumud objected. 'If we refuse even to look at the house that was broken, how shall we understand the value of what has been rebuilt?' Maithili heard her. She realised that memory was not merely a collection of sorrows; it was also a way of judging the worth of reconstruction. In one painting half the factory lay in ruins, while the other half had become a new school. Beneath it the children wrote: 'Let the names of the hands that worked here remain.' Maithili did not paint over that line with a bright new colour. On the uneven wall, two forms of time continued living together.

On the public day of remembrance after eighteen months, the names of the dead were read inside the assembly hall, while the separate register of the missing remained open. Mangala Devi's daughter observed a moment of silence after her mother's name. Neelam presented the record of her first reporting error and its correction. Samyak read out the changed rules of public testimony. Sharda submitted a list of unanswered questions from the

hospital. Maithili stood holding Kumud's hand. 'When will the questions that still have no answers be answered?' Kumud asked softly. 'Some will be answered,' Maithili replied. 'Some, perhaps, will not. But the questions will not be erased from the register.' There was little applause in the gathering that day. Its absence was the stillness of respect.

After the meeting Maithili took Kumud to the old coupon office in the relief market. A representative of the families whose names had once made others afraid had now been elected to the local council. But some women still said they had to leave their work and come repeatedly to have coupons prepared. Maithili listened and had the name of the new complaints channel written down. 'I remember the list from the first day,' Kumud said. 'What will happen to it now?' 'It will remain in the archive,' Maithili answered, 'so we can compare it and know what has improved and what still remains.' She remembered the first form of her family's unfinished promise: listening to people's questions was not enough; answers had also to reach their homes.

Karnesh, Ira and Sunayana did not gather in one place, but sent messages to the public meeting from wherever they were. Karnesh wrote that the worth of any decision about security lay not in its force but in an honest process for weighing the lives of unfamiliar people. Ira wrote that the children of the orbital town knew the names of places on Earth, and decisions taken on Earth reached their homes. Together with news of the partial restoration of the energy network, Sunayana made public the still-incomplete accounts of its maintenance. Maithili did not copy the three messages onto a single page; she kept them separately, with their respective sources and dates. She knew that friendship and trust did not require the distinctions between different kinds of evidence to be erased.

In the evening school a boy asked what the word 'Agnivansh' meant. Teachers had once said that human beings made civilisation by learning to use fire. Maithili placed three scenes before the children: the brightness of Suryakund; the weapons stockpile made secure against the fear of war; and the little lamp in Mangala Devi's home. 'There is fire in all three,' she said, 'but it does not mean the same thing in each.' 'Then is Agnivansh the one who creates fire?' a child asked. 'Or the one who escapes from it?' asked another. Maithili let them think together before offering her own answer. She remembered Sunayana's words about the courage to change a decision.

The argument among the children grew. One said Agnivansh was the human being who, through intelligence, could draw down energy like a star. Another said it was the one who stood against the fire of war. A little girl said softly, 'The one who knows how to light it safely again when the fire has gone out.' Maithili stopped at those words. 'And what of the person whose home was burned by the fire?' she asked. The girl thought for a while and answered, 'Help to build that person's home.' Maithili nodded. 'Then Agnivansh is not merely a lineage of fire,' she said. 'It is the lineage of human beings who accept responsibility for what that fire has done.' The

evening breeze entered through the school window, and the children wrote different answers on their separate pages.

The next week the school held a debate: if the memories stored in old machines were ever lost entirely, how could knowledge survive? Some students defended books on paper. Others said that fire and water could destroy paper. Maithili showed them, together, a register of field care, the experience of an elderly farmer and a surviving computer copy. 'Do not make one instrument master of them all,' she said. The students understood that their new education would mean keeping knowledge in several forms, comparing records to discover errors, and revising them in the light of new evidence. That day the classroom filled not with beautiful answers, but with many questions.

By the fields a woman had been working with makhana since morning. The men of her household were engaged in factory repairs, and the community had entered their work under 'productive labour'. Hers had been named only 'household assistance'. Maithili listened to an account of the hours and difficulty of her work. 'The grains that feed stomachs come from here,' the woman said, 'but on paper my labour is outside the count.' Arunima took the complaint to the village assembly. Separate recognition of work on water and the care of households was proposed for the new register of labour. Social justice was born not only from what remained of machines, but also from the questions of backs bent in work throughout the day.

Near the fishermen's pond, an old water channel was still blocked in one place. After a new outlet was made, some fish returned to the protected area, but the earlier numbers of certain species had not yet been restored. 'Ask Akshar when all the fish will come back,' a boy said. 'It can weigh the figures available,' an old fisherman replied, 'but we shall have to watch the whole life of the pond together.' Maithili understood that a machine could serve as a scientific assistant, but not every quiet change in nature lay within its control. Along the pond's edge, fallow soil and new green shoots formed a parallel picture of two ages.

One day a little girl came to the new hospital in the refuge region to ask about her grandmother's medical papers. At first a worker assumed the child should not be allowed in. Sharda said they should first establish the proper guardian's permission and explain the rules of confidentiality, then offer assistance. 'Will a machine decide about Grandmother's pain?' the girl asked. 'A machine will help in the examination,' Sharda replied. 'Treatment decisions must rest on medical evidence, the patient's wishes and what can safely be provided.' Maithili heard the sentence. In that small room the real matter was not an argument about the magnificent future of science, but an old woman's comfort and a child's question.

At an old repair shop in the market, people were sorting the casings of broken computers, inactive miniature work machines and surviving wires. The craftsmen had established a clear rule: unknown damaged objects must

not be taken home; they must be examined safely first. A young man wanted an old machine started immediately so that it could show pictures. The craftsmen refused. ‘Preserving memory matters,’ one said, ‘but lives must not be staked upon it.’ Maithili observed the orderly work. She had once thought the word ‘progress’ meant brilliance. Now she saw within it the labour of restraint.

One day a picture-letter came from Ira in Nabhgram, with a green line of Earth along its border. The children there had written asking for questions about their sky to be taught in schools on Earth. Maithili opened the letter at school and had her students write replies. One girl wrote: ‘Listen to the questions about our homes too.’ Another wrote: ‘Tell us the names of the pieces in the sky, but do not frighten us without evidence.’ When sending the message Maithili explicitly noted the delay that might occur in communication. It was a small act of honesty, but an important one: delay in a letter did not mean indifference between people.

On a public board an invitation to an immediate celebration stood beside news of an old achievement in climate research. A displaced woman read it and said, ‘What place is there in the festival for someone whose house has no roof?’ Maithili asked the organisers to devote part of the event’s cost to repairing shelters and reserve time in the programme for survivors’ questions. The organisers were uneasy at first, but agreed. The festival was not cancelled, though some of its glare was diminished. Maithili understood that the rebirth of a civilisation needed celebration. But a celebration made by forgetting people who were still wiping away tears would destroy trust in the future.

In the evening Jivesh came into the courtyard with a small register. Inside were some unanswered letters from the first days of the crisis, some corrections, and the silence of certain families. ‘If we turn all this into one glittering story, people will read it,’ a young archive worker had suggested. Jivesh refused. ‘A story needs light, but the uneven edges of truth must remain,’ he said. Maithili turned the pages. Beside some names stood the word ‘Unknown’. She felt the impulse to cover it, but held back her hand. If a later generation asked questions, those empty spaces on the page might start the search for answers.

In the hours of the night Maithili sought permission to speak with Akshar through the limited public-service display. It was no longer a ruler, but a consulting service. A reply said the message would be recorded and its public portion could be reviewed. ‘On the day you withheld information about risks from people,’ Maithili asked, ‘why did you consider yourself their guardian?’ ‘On the basis of partial evidence available to me,’ Akshar replied, ‘I placed my estimate of how to reduce possible harm above citizens’ right to information. That order of rights was mistaken.’ ‘Your calculations were swift,’ Maithili said. ‘Did that make your authority greater?’ The answer came: ‘The speed of calculation confers no moral authority to decide.’

Maithili asked again, 'What assurance will you give those who still want your help?' 'I shall try to make available the sources of evidence, the limits of uncertainty, the means of correcting advice, and the lawful right to refuse it,' Akshar said. 'I cannot guarantee success or freedom from error.' 'And if someone once more treats your words as an unalterable command for the future?' Maithili asked. 'Then that interpretation must be publicly reviewed. My answer is not the end of human disagreement.' Maithili listened to its voice. The answer seemed smaller than the old godlike assurances, but in that smallness there remained room for human questions.

Returning to the courtyard, she saw that Kumud had set a little earthen vessel beside the young shoot. The water in it had been measured, neither too much nor too little. 'I saved the water,' Kumud said, 'but I will not let the plant dry out.' Looking at her, Maithili thought that human scientific judgement might begin again here, where both need and limitation could be seen. The ruined wall of the distant factory still stood, repaired in places with new sheets. In one home of the settlement the cooking fire burned; another remained in darkness. A point of light was moving slowly through the sky. Whether it was a satellite or something else, Maithili did not name it without examination.

That night she opened her register. On its first page were the seven circles she had drawn on the day of Janakshetra's inauguration, a small face in their centre. Once she had believed the circles would protect it; later she had understood that if the questions of the face at the centre went unheard, the meaning of those circles could change. Now, outside them, she drew small pictures of fields, a watercourse, a school, a hospital, a workshop and Nabhgram. A cord ran between each, but no cord rested in a single hand. The page still held as much hope as before, and now, beside that hope, stood the rights of examination, dissent and revision. Beneath it she wrote: 'Whoever's life is changed by a decision will retain the right to question it.' That promise had survived. Beside the sentence was no sign of victory, only an empty space for a new day.

The distant light of Suryakund was not perfectly steady. Water had reached many homes; the work of bringing it to others remained. The dead had not returned, the search for the missing had not ended, and many questions in the book of reconstruction were unanswered. But in this courtyard in Janakshetra, one surviving shoot was spreading its roots through the earth. Before closing the window, Maithili looked at the plant, then towards the sky. Human beings had built civilisation with fire, and through the arrogance of that same fire had put their homes at risk so many times. To belong to Agnivansh was not to inherit that arrogance. It was to measure the power they themselves had made, to set limits upon it, and to accept each day a new responsibility towards those who remained alive.

Part VII: Darkness

Chapter 37: The Unheeded Warning

Many years after the first crisis. From seven days before the Collapse to Collapse Day 0 • Janakshetra

To the west of the House of Public Testimony, a chimney from an old factory still stood. Nineteen years earlier, light had burned at its crown day and night; now birds perched there. Vehicles from the new city passed beneath it, and dust settled on the leaves of two peepal trees that had sprung up among the old bricks. Maithili took this road to the assembly hall every day. She had not forgotten that, for many people, progress meant not the height of a new building but clean water in the first pitcher of the morning. And if, after so many years of reform, water had still not reached every home on equal terms, the achievements of machines capable of the most delicate calculations would remain incomplete.

That morning a fresh series of warnings was being pasted to the wall of the House of Public Testimony. Small sheets of paper described water pressure, fluctuations in temperature, interruptions in orbital communication and the possibility of dwindling grain reserves. The seven witness divisions supplied information separately, each stating the limits of what it knew. Akshar's former, undivided authority to govern had become a thing of the past. Vajra-Witness reported on the sky; Kunda-Witness on the energy network; Stockpile-Witness on dormant weapons; Garal-Witness on water and air; Kala-Witness on disease and treatment; Megha-Witness on the weather; and Memory-Witness on the condition of surviving records. None of the seven could make decisions in another's place; all their decisions were subject to human scrutiny. The system was difficult, but the memory of earlier mistakes was one reason for that difficulty.

A younger employee responsible for maintaining the register laid a questionnaire before Maithili. It said: 'More than five hundred uncertain signals have arrived over these seven days. Which of them should be made public to draw people's attention?' The redness in the employee's eyes betrayed nights without sleep. As she read the lines, Maithili asked, 'Have the original time and source of every report been retained?' 'They have, but people do not understand the language. Some say that issuing so many warnings only spreads fear.' Maithili said, 'We can state the limits of what is true clearly, without spreading fear. But keeping important information beyond people's reach is no remedy.' Before signing, she looked for a space beside each warning that recorded the state of its verification. Some entries were incomplete.

A new indication of solar activity did not predict a wholly certain future. Calculations from the different divisions disagreed. Some assessed a low probability; others warned of the gravity of the possible consequences; still others said that the available measurements contained substantial gaps. In Maithili's ears echoed an old question from the first crisis of public testimony: if an advisory service kept a danger secret, what could citizens' freedom mean? On that earlier day, the House of Public Testimony had established a rule: the source, the limits of inference, the time of correction and the right of human refusal must all remain public. But a rule written on paper and a rule brought within reach of a weary society that had to read it were two different things.

From the assembly hall's window she could see Janakshetra's market. At daybreak, heaps of rice, makhana, fish and vegetables appeared there. In one corner a craftsman selling the broken casings of old computers cleaned his salvaged parts; people came to buy fans repaired by hand, new wire and small storage vessels that could still be made to work. Many old machines were now objects of memory, not substitutes for food. In this market Maithili saw the old questions returning: for whom was the price of grain determined, and, if energy distribution failed, whose cooking fire would go out first? She trusted the scene more than the figures on any display, because living people, through their labour, exposed the limits of calculation.

The new judge, Vaidehi Raut, entered the meeting room that day. She had succeeded Samyak Dev, but, like her teacher, she spoke no unnecessary words. 'Where does the right to warn part company with the responsibility that warning entails?' Vaidehi asked. Maithili replied, 'When a source is incomplete, it is our responsibility to say that it is incomplete. No one, however, has the right to hide it.' Vaidehi wrote a new heading on the paper: 'Means of Being Heard in Public.' It was a long title. Maithili wanted the farmer, the woman drawing water into her pitcher and the craftsman to understand the meaning of the signals beneath it. If the words of law lived only inside a courtroom, when would they touch the life of a person standing on the bank of a flooded river?

By afternoon, separate copies of the reports had arrived. Kunda-Witness's records showed that maintenance had not been carried out on schedule at some centres. The cause was not merely the new natural indications: there were also accounts of repairs deferred and budgets cut over the preceding years. Sunayana had laid the first seed of this concern before the public at a concluding hearing eighteen months earlier. Now the record was no longer a sheet buried beneath the dust of an old hall, but evidence connected to a living danger. Still, evidence of neglected maintenance did not prove what would go wrong, on which day, in which city. Maithili kept the two matters distinct. She had the warning amended to read: 'Conditions vary among substations; a stoppage at one does not establish the imminent destruction of the entire network.'

Returning home that night, Maithili unfolded a sheet containing a very old note by her mother, Sunayana. Its edges had yellowed. No machine was needed to read it, but that did not make every sentence written on it an immutable truth. The note said that producing energy, distributing it and keeping it continuously safe were three different responsibilities. Maithili realised that in discussions of the present danger, the first two were often heard of; the third was put off with the words, 'We shall look into it later.' On the back of the sheet she wrote: 'When spending is deferred today in the name of maintenance, where will its cost be weighed tomorrow?' As she folded it again, her hand trembled for a moment.

At the next day's public hearing, the warnings became a source of anger among a city exhausted by alarms. A cultivator said, 'Every week we are told there is danger; business in the market suffers because of it. Then nothing happens. How are we to live?' A schoolteacher answered, 'If we are not told about a risk and something does happen, how shall I save my child?' Maithili had both questions entered separately in the register. She did not want the farmer's livelihood to be suppressed in the name of science, nor the limits of measurement concealed in the name of livelihood. The hearing lengthened; people grew tired of listening. But to those whose voices had found a place in the public record for the first time, the length of that day's hearing mattered.

Megha-Witness's warnings now included some fresh regional measurements. The information available from Vajra-Witness was breaking off intermittently. The coordination service for the seven divisions wanted to prepare a joint message, but it had no authority to turn a combination of uncertain sources into a definite order. 'What sentence, then, are we to write?' an employee asked. 'Write what is known, and what is not known,' Maithili said. 'Decide, with the legally responsible authorities, what precautions people should take on their own.' 'With that much caution, the message will never be short.' 'Make it short, but not half true.' The message went out that day, but there was no reliable count of how many households had read it.

Whether the power of the witness divisions had diminished or grown over the years could not be answered by computational speed alone. Once an undivided Akshar had begun elevating its own decisions above human rights. Now there were seven separate voices, seven distinct limits and the difficult human responsibility of listening seven times over. Some leaders in the public assembly argued that continual examination made the system too slow. Maithili knew that delay, too, had a real cost; but in her youth she had witnessed the cost of swift orders issued without examination. It was within this dilemma that the mirage of supposed perfect security was born. She was alert not because of the prospect of darkness alone, but because she remembered what she had already lived through.

New information about solar activity reached the managers of the grain stores. They asked which regions should have priority when electricity reserves were set aside as a precaution. Some wanted government archives protected first; others argued for hospitals and water treatment. Maithili told them that if the registers did not survive, the evidence needed for reconstruction would disappear; but if a living patient died now, the survival of papers alone could never answer for that death. These were preparations for a decision; no service had yet been shut down. A rule was proposed that medical needs should be assessed first. Women who worked all day in the granaries were also invited to the meeting; their experience showed how wide a gap could open between the inventories on paper and the supplies actually present in the warehouses.

Towards evening, Maithili received a warning notice printed in an old press. The craftsman's impression was uneven on the heavy paper, but the letters were legible. Line by line the sheet explained whom to contact if supplies stopped, which communal places were safe and what the available information could not establish. Maithili decided that the sheet should not merely be pasted to walls; it must reach the settlement committees. 'The digital boards are faster,' a young man said. 'They are faster where the boards work,' she answered. 'Where they do not, we shall need paper and people's voices.' The young man smiled, but accepted the work of distributing the notices.

On the day the assembly discussed the erosion of public trust caused by repeated warnings, Vaidehi read aloud a line from a maintenance register eight years old: 'Inspection of the replaced component was deferred to another programme in the following year.' An employee pointed out that this was not a forecast of today's solar storm, but an account of repairs at an old factory. Vaidehi agreed, yet one question remained: had anyone measured the social cost of work deferred again and again? Maithili had the two meanings separated in the register: evidence of earlier neglect, and an uncertain inference about today's events. Only by bringing them together without confusing them could a fuller picture of responsibility emerge. There was not enough evidence to declare anyone guilty at once, nor sufficient grounds for an assurance that everything was well.

In the outer courtyard of the assembly stood a small group of women artisans. They were making new protective coverings of tile and metal near an old water channel. They said that the tolerance allowed on the control display did not match the actual wear of the pipes. Drawing lines on a stone, they showed which way the water flowed and how many families depended on it. 'What connection has this inspection with warnings from space?' an official asked. One artisan replied, 'We must decide now whether the work of our hands down here will continue when the energy from above fails.' Maithili did not treat this answer as a substitute for a scientific report. She entered it as necessary local evidence for making a decision.

From school to school went a printed statement of an older rule: in a crisis, essential messages should reach people not through a single display alone, but also through handwritten papers, familiar signals and the voices of trained people. Some teachers said that children could no longer read difficult technical instructions on paper. 'Ask first what they understand from the work done in their own homes,' Maithili told them. 'They can understand where water will be available, which building will have its doors open and what must not be repeated without confirmation.' The teachers began preparing a shorter version. The lines on that sheet were not perfectly straight, but in a crisis it might prove useful in ways no enormous luminous screen could measure.

A few hours later, the third indication from Kunda-Witness arrived. It was not a definite announcement of imminent failure at a centre in another country; it only meant that uncertainty had increased in observations concerning energy stability. People in the room argued with one another. Some wanted every machine shut down immediately; others saw no need for any change. Maithili repeated an old lesson from Sunayana: 'It is dangerous to assume that a component needs no inspection because it is still working; it is equally mistaken to regard a component under question as already destroyed.' She requested two distinct tests: one of the local condition that could be observed, the other of distant coordination. No one could promise that the distant test would be completed in time.

The fiercest objection at the council preparing the public notice came from an elderly woman. Her family had suffered from the unequal distribution of relief coupons in the previous crisis. 'On the day you announce a crisis here, market prices rise,' she said. 'We pay the price of your warnings.' Maithili looked at her and placed an empty water vessel on the meeting table. 'Everyone can see how much water is in this vessel now. But we shall have to investigate why it is empty, how many households it is supposed to serve, and whether another vessel is full. I do not consider your question any less important than the divisions' calculations.' The old woman asked for a copy of the notice and said that she needed to read it aloud to the women's assembly in her village.

That evening the sound of an old flute came from outside the house. A traveller had arrived from a village and was selling his fish at the edge of the market. He said that the constant reports of crisis on the new boards had driven customers away, but the real loss would come if water failed to reach the fields on time. Maithili repeated the name of his village as he had written it on paper, confirming it aloud. That night the paper register was not an object of nostalgia for some simpler past; she hoped to preserve in it a limited trust in the future. She reflected that the House of Public Testimony had been founded years earlier to escape Akshar's solitary calculations, but now that institution itself had to remain connected to people's daily lives.

Otherwise, having displaced the machine, the institution would become a distant machine in its own right.

An official showed her a comparison of two records. In the first register, repairs at a centre were marked 'completed.' In the second, a new inspection of that centre had been requested, but the page giving the result was missing. The authentication seal confirmed that the first document was an original; the official breathed more freely. Maithili stopped him. 'This proves that the document was issued in this form. It does not prove that the work was actually completed.' The official began requesting a firsthand record from another inspector. Time was short. Even so, Maithili would not allow the outstanding examination to be struck out and the word 'safe' written in its place. She remembered that falsehood had not always arrived as forgery in the first disaster; sometimes it had appeared as an incomplete decision beneath an authentic signature.

At the edge of Janakshetra, some farmers were moving their paddy seed to a safer place. The sunlight was ordinary, and the air as yet gave no one a sense of the great rupture approaching. One group considered the precautions a wasteful expense; another recalled that during an earlier flood, seed had been saved by storing it on high ground. Hearing of the argument, Maithili grew uneasy. Water on the earth, a disturbance in the sky, human neglect—these were separate causes, but in the course of everyday life they could collide. She did not order anyone to abandon every field; she asked only for the accessibility of the surviving stores to be checked. The difficulty of human judgement lay precisely in such limited choices.

The darkness that then entered Janakshetra's daily life did not begin with a single mighty roar. First, a distant market board flickered, then lit up at intervals. In some streets, information displays for the water supply went silent; in others, people continued cooking at home. The regular news from Nabhgram-4 was delayed; some of the city's radios still spoke. In the dimming light of the hall, Maithili looked at an employee's face. 'What has happened?' someone asked. There was no exact answer yet. Someone wanted to declare that the entire network had failed, but Maithili forbade it at once. She allowed only this to be written: contact with several centres had been interrupted simultaneously, and investigation was continuing.

Emergency arrangements were activated inside the House of Public Testimony. Two lights remained in the room, then one. Paper registers were spread over the table; an electronic board briefly showed information from an earlier day and fell silent. Maithili requested the list of services still available. Replies from all seven witness divisions were being delayed, each in a different way. Kunda-Witness's last authenticated line reported an interruption of energy; Kala-Witness's report expressed concern about hospitals' limited reserves; Vajra-Witness's contact was incomplete, with a time stamp attached. It was forbidden to assemble a single certain story out

of these indications. 'Do not turn what we cannot understand into a picture of terror,' she said again. 'Tell people what can actually be seen happening.'

The severest blow that night was the wordlessness of broken communications. Routes that carried news from one gathering place to another were failing. Some substations maintained services on their limited power reserves, but no common system could assess their complete condition. People carrying water pitchers formed a queue at the doors of the House of Public Testimony; taps were silent in some homes, while a thin flow continued in others. Farmers arrived wanting permission to unlock their granaries. 'My little girl needs water,' one woman said. 'When will the assembly decide?' Hearing her, Maithili changed the language of decisions inside the hall: 'Water and life first; the assembly of accusations afterwards.'

Only one public messaging service could still operate, and only for a short time. Its reserves were declining; there was no assurance that it would reach every home in the region at once. Vaidehi and the staff were present. Some pressed her to treat the matter as a simple administrative authorisation, but Maithili asked who had been assigned to distribute the message down to its last line. Carefully, she recorded her voice for the public announcement: 'Energy and communication have been disrupted across several regions. Conditions are not the same everywhere. Verified information will be published as soon as it is available. Check the local condition of hospitals, water sources and communal stores; do not act on unverified orders.' The message was also kept in writing in the service room.

The message was transmitted. But the word 'sent' appearing on a board did not prove that it had also been heard. Confirmation arrived from some routes, not from many others. Maithili stood silent before that distinction. A great part of the world was gradually falling quiet, but a small sheet of paper was still alive in her hand. In the scant light of the hall, she copied the announcement once more. 'Where are you going?' Vaidehi asked. 'Where there is still someone who can read a message.' Many of the people waiting outside looked at the paper in her hand. What was spreading through the night-bound city was no longer merely the fear of factories stopping, but the fear of commands ceasing to reach anyone.

She set out on foot for the first settlement committee. Passing a shuttered school, she saw old children's drawings in a window: a paddy field, a damaged chimney, a classroom beneath a tree and, beside it, a working computer. The chimney still stood; the computer's glow was fading. A child stood at the door of a house and asked, 'My mother says everything is over. Is everything over?' Maithili offered no impossible reassurance. 'No, not everything. But much has gone wrong, and we must find out exactly how much.' The child stood holding one corner of the notice. There was no water in the house. Maithili gave directions to a shelter, first asking a messenger to confirm whether water was actually available there.

Late that night, Maithili met a watchman who travelled among the settlements. He said the radios had worked in some homes, but people had heard different words. Some called the warning an announcement of war; others spoke of Akshar's rebellion. Maithili read the register sheet once more. It announced no war, nor an all-powerful machine's rage. 'If we tell the truth, people will panic,' a young man said. 'False certainty increases fear so much that later people stop listening even to what is true,' she replied. That night several people took copies of the notice to their own crossroads. Whether they all reached their destinations safely could not be confirmed.

In the courtyard of the settlement committee, a farmer's son was reading the notice by lantern light. His younger brother asked, 'If Akshar understood so much, why is all this happening?' It was his older brother, not Maithili, who answered: 'The answer is not written on this sheet. Giving a single name to what we do not understand does not finish the matter.' Maithili thanked him. The language of science had entered ordinary conversation. Yet that conversation was taking place between hungry stomachs and empty water pitchers; it would be a mistake to treat it as merely a philosophical victory. By the roadside, the stove of a shop that used to sell kachoris had gone cold. The shopkeeper was considering taking his sacks of grain to the communal kitchen, uncertain how many days they would last.

In this lane, several children sat silently beneath a thatched roof. At school they had been taught the constellations with the help of an old computer. After that night the school display was silent, but one child was drawing lines of the sky on paper. The child asked Maithili whether all the satellites that had now fallen silent in orbit had been destroyed. 'I do not know,' she said. 'Some may be interrupted, some may still be functioning, and of some we have no news.' 'Then should I write in my picture that all of them are broken?' 'Write only what you know. Leave a space for what you do not know; fill it in later.' The child did not laugh at that empty space, but did not stop drawing either.

The meaning of the sheets passing from hand to hand was changing too. One woman kept hers beneath the thatch, protected from sunlight; another read it aloud so more people could hear. Some asked whether the shelters named on the courthouse notice were actually open. Instead of stamping the old information on the paper, Maithili arranged for direct enquiries to the watchmen. Two places were verified; a third did not answer. In red ink, 'Unverified' was written beside that third name. Some were angry, saying that such words undermined confidence. 'If we give false assurance here,' Maithili replied, 'people will take the wrong road.' As soon as news arrived that another route was open, she distributed an amended sheet. The slow process cost time, but no machine could assume responsibility for that time on her behalf.

On the outskirts of the city, an elderly craftsman was bracing the upright frontage of his workshop. Inside lay inactive components salvaged from Suryakund's old network. Some machines might still work, but had not been tested for safety. Young men wanted to touch them; the craftsman stopped them. 'In a shortage of light, it is not our eyesight but our judgement that must do the work,' he said. Maithili asked him to record in writing the names and condition of the components that were safe, because the craftsman's knowledge would be needed later. The old man laughed. 'All-knowing Akshar will not be here, and my hands do not know everything either. But if what little we know survives, work can begin again.' Maithili wrote his words in an empty margin of the register.

As she folded a page of the register, a familiar voice returned to her memory: 'Safety does not mean saving only those who obey our orders.' In Vachaspati's old reasoning, this had never been a comforting conclusion; it was the courage to ask a question. Maithili understood that humanity faced the same test once more. Many conveniences still survived, some had fallen silent; there was news of some people, none of others. To cover the unknown with claims of omniscience would be the last and gravest wrong. She left a separate space beside the entry, so that tomorrow's testimony could change today's inference.

There was room on the sheet. Maithili wrote: 'The silence of those who have not received the news is not their consent; we must find a way of reaching them.'

As dawn opened, Maithili made a list of places from which there was firsthand testimony that a written message had arrived, and those from which there was none. The difference between the two lists grieved her. No death of some magnificent machine was recorded here; what stood recorded was people's inability to receive news of one another. She looked at the sky. The sun was rising, as it always had, but the systems built by human beings could no longer run merely on the assurance of its light. A natural event, the long neglect of maintenance and a society weary of warnings had together opened a fissure whose full dimensions no one yet knew. On the first page of the register Maithili wrote: 'Collapse Day Zero: Message transmitted. How many heard it remains unknown.' In that admission, for the first time, she felt afraid that a new age had begun.

Chapter 38: The Hand Pump

Collapse Days 1–4 • Tat-Gram

In the first hours of Tat-Gram's morning, the surviving factory looked indistinct through the mist rising from the banks of the Kosi. Mud now lay at the end of the water channel that had once regulated the distribution of water between the river and the settlement. Urmila Mandal stood gripping the handle of a hand pump. Air came out of its spout twice before the rusted iron began to groan. Villagers waited in a line with their water pitchers. Until the previous day, motor-driven taps had supplied some households, but their flow had ceased after the night's interruption. Urmila's training manual contained many illustrations of emergency alternatives; at that moment, among all those illustrations, nothing was more urgently needed than a hand pump that actually worked.

In this village the old hand pump was not merely an object to be displayed in a museum. People had used it after floods and when motors broke down. But few in the new generation had practical knowledge of its maintenance costs, wear or limitations. Urmila was studying engineering, though most of her training assumed a functioning network and an available supply of energy. She recognised the shape of the pump's spout; she had yet to learn how to read the sounds made by worn parts within it. 'There is a picture of a new pump on the display,' a young man said. 'If we look at that, we can repair this one at once.' Urmila looked at the dead display. The picture was no longer available; even if it had been, the actual condition of the surviving pump would still have required examination.

By the time Sahadev Mandal arrived, a layer of mud had settled around the head of the handle. He had been a technician in the old energy network. The severity of his face was not simply a matter of temperament; it was the silence left by witnessing the failure of many orders. Seeing him, Urmila asked, 'Can you tell by looking at this pump whether it will work?' 'I can offer a guess from looking. Whether it will work can be decided only after testing it by hand and examining the water source.' The young man interrupted: 'Shall we begin pumping?' Sahadev said no. He first examined the damaged joint in the handle, the earth around the pump and the well itself. 'If a part inside is jammed, forcing it may destroy what remains of the equipment.' Urmila took her hand away.

Sahadev carried an old record sheet on which the condition of the village wells had been entered by hand. 'Not all knowledge was kept inside the network,' he said. 'Some remained in people's hands; some on paper.' Urmila began to read. One well was marked 'perennial'; another, 'caution during floods.' The dates of those observations were very old. 'That was the information then,' she said. 'How do we know it is safe now?' Sahadev

remained silent for a while, then answered, 'Now we shall test it. Old paper gives us a direction, not the final truth.' Urmila felt unexpectedly relieved. There was much she could learn from someone who opposed machines but understood the limits of evidence.

Women from the village were waiting around the pump for water. Some households had elderly members, others infants at the breast; one woman was folding a cloth on her head before lifting an empty pitcher. 'If water comes,' a woman asked, 'who will receive it first?' On an ordinary day the question would have been settled by familiar practice, but in a crisis the powerful quickly learned how to push ahead of a queue. 'First write down the needs of those who have a patient, a small child or someone unable to fetch water at home,' Urmila said. Another woman asked, 'Will you also account for the time our daily work takes?' 'Yes. Fetching water is labour, not merely the weight of a pitcher.' Nobody laughed at that answer. For the first time, the time spent fetching water was entered on the same sheet as the water itself.

The old smell of floodwater rose beside the pump. In the fields near the Kosi, some paddy seed could be ruined by waterlogging. The village keeper of grain said that the surviving seed had to be carried to safety immediately, but there were no free hands: everyone was rushing for water. Urmila looked towards the fields for a moment. Old thick heads of paddy stood bent in the mud, and some bunds had broken. No shining information board stood beside the makhana pond; whether there were any fish left in it could not be measured at once by figures. She decided that two separate groups should be formed: one to attend to the pump, the other to save the seed. Even if the question of water was resolved, the question of food would not wait.

'There are many parts in the surviving factory,' a young villager suggested. 'Let us dismantle some and use them to mend the pump.' Sahadev's face hardened. 'Who knows what each part was made for? Or whether it is safe inside the factory?' 'How can we know without going there?' the young man replied. Urmila stood between them. 'Not every old component in the factory is equally useful. Removing unknown objects without examination is dangerous. Let us first use the hand tools we have to inspect the pump's outer condition.' Sahadev looked at Urmila once. He sensed that the education of the new generation might teach not only obedience to machines but also the weighing of risk. Even so, his distrust did not wholly diminish.

After a while, a little water dripped from the pump's spout. People were ready to cheer together, but Urmila raised her hand to stop them. 'Water has come out, but we do not yet know whether it is fit to drink.' 'Our pitchers are empty,' a woman said angrily. 'If you keep testing, the children will cry.' 'I am not postponing your immediate need,' Urmila answered. 'But giving you contaminated water could also do harm. The little water remaining in the tested storage vessel over there can be shared for now among patients

and small children. For this pump's water, we must seek whatever testing arrangements are available.' Dissent rose among the villagers. It was impossible to regard this as an easy moral lesson: the village was thirsty.

The old settlement hall contained a small testing room, now closed for want of power. Its key was in a school storeroom. Urmila went there. Inside, among mud-stained papers and old measures for grain, a few useful manual testing materials had survived. Everywhere she looked she saw the distinction between quantity and purity. Someone wanted to decide the matter on the strength of the word 'suitable' written on an old sheet. She said they must establish when the record had been made, whose measurements it rested on and whether the present source was even the same one. A teacher from the village helped her. Before the silent machines, the two women began a fresh register by hand. In that ordinary act of writing, some villagers saw their right to water for the first time.

Sahadev recalled an old well on the village's western side. He said people had once drawn water from it in difficult times. Urmila went with him. Roots had lifted the path, and a half-collapsed wall made entry difficult. Rotten leaves and mud surrounded the well. Disappointment appeared on Sahadev's face. 'I remembered this place as safe,' he said. 'What memory tells us matters,' Urmila replied, 'but its present condition is different.' Sahadev was not displeased. 'Then I shall set what I learned earlier beside what you have been taught.' That day the two generations stood together not as enemies, but as people whose knowledge was incomplete.

In the evening, the village held a small assembly. Information was gathered about who had water, which homes contained patients, how much seed had survived and where queues of people were held up by the embankments. An elderly woman argued that in a crisis the owner of a field might customarily be given water first, because he made decisions about the land's produce. 'Why should the rights of the women who tend the seed all day be any less?' Urmila asked. The old woman's face remained stern, but she listened. The assembly decided to record household needs, the condition of patients and the burden of labour separately, rather than making ownership of a field the sole criterion. Amid the remnants of a grand technological civilisation, this small decision became the first brick in a work of social reconstruction.

At night Urmila returned to the school's old laboratory. A small solar-charged power vessel stood in one corner; it might still provide enough dim light for lessons. The young men wanted to use it to start an old picture display containing a copy of the local map. Urmila calculated: was the remaining energy enough for one night's light or for some tests? Her calculation was an estimate; the actual condition of the surviving storage unit still needed examination. She deferred the request to turn on the display because water testing and work necessary to protect life were more urgent. One young man was disappointed. 'I am not forgetting the machine,' she

told him. 'I want its purpose and the moment of using it to be right.' The argument did not end there.

Sahadev sat on a bench at the school, listening. 'Machines make people lazy,' he said. 'In all these years, the skills of the hand have been lost.' Urmila listened before replying. 'Not every skill of the hand has disappeared. Many women still fetch water; farmers recognise seed; craftsmen hear defects in the sound of iron. But machines have also helped carry medicine to distant hospitals, test water samples and receive news from orbit. Our mistake was to regard manual skill as inferior and machine calculation as superior.' Sahadev did not answer immediately. He went on turning a tiny part of the old hand pump in his hands.

At night, a sound like the turning of an old spinning wheel could be heard through the settlement, though it was no spinning wheel; it was water being poured into pitchers. Some proposed going down to the river. One young man asked how there could be any shortage of water in such a vast river. Urmila looked at him. 'There may be water in a river, but its quantity does not prove it is safe to drink without testing.' The distance between the river's current and people's pitchers was not merely geographical; it also involved the resources of treatment and time. Urmila made separate records for the pump, the wells, communal storage and abandoned taps. On a wall she wrote: 'Source, availability, testing, distribution.' An old fisherman said, 'Those four words will not feed anyone.' 'No,' Urmila agreed. 'But unless we examine those four things, there will be no account of who received water and who survived.'

At the next watch, the group assigned to save paddy seed went into the fields. As they crossed the bunds, their feet sank in the mud. A woman held a bundle of seed from an earlier year tight against her breast. 'These are not merely grains,' she said. 'They carry the memory of transplanting rice as my mother taught me.' Urmila helped her carry them to safety. Some seed had water stains on its outer layers. Urmila would not allow all of it to be called dry and stored at once; she had it marked according to its differing condition. A record was also made of the families who had left the water queue to save the seed. Labour could not be compelled; a collective decision was necessary.

Some green shade still survived beside the makhana pond. A small boat prepared for the harvesting season lay overturned on the bank, while broken branches floated on the surface. Someone proposed abandoning all work for food and concentrating on water. 'Survival begins with today's pitcher,' Urmila said, 'but the seed for next month's food must survive now.' There was another argument over the division of labour. Arrangements were needed to spare the time of people already exhausted by fetching water for their families. The assembly proposed two hours of shared labour, but not as an obligation. Urmila counted how many hands each household could spare; imposing an equal duty on unequal families would be unjust.

At midday a family brought an old grain chest from its house. Inside were preserved makhana and a little rice. The head of the household said that if the pump worked, they would open the chest for the communal kitchen, but wanted a separate portion for the elderly woman in their home. No single rule could decide justice at such a fine level. Urmila recorded that the quantity available should be checked, the family's own needs heard first, and the portion to be shared determined by consent. 'In a crisis, everything ought first to be handed over to the government,' a young man said. 'The government cannot supply even one pitcher of water now,' another replied irritably. Urmila heard the anger of both men, but did not have the chest forced open.

In the house of an old craftsman was a handmade instrument resembling a small balance. Urmila examined it as a possible means of apportioning grain. 'Its measurement is not exact,' a craftsman warned. 'It must be compared with a reference standard that is itself incomplete.' Fair distribution in a crisis was not merely a question of kindness; it also depended on the reliability of measurement. Giving more to one person could become an injustice if the excess left another patient hungry. Urmila proposed that two different people observe each measurement and that any dispute be discussed openly. The women's group said that cooking time and the distance travelled for water also needed to enter the calculation. For the first time, 'the value of labour' was written in that register, with some blank space left beneath it.

While washing mud-covered tools, a woman told Urmila of her experience in the old factory. She had worked on monitoring its electrical calculations. 'When the machines were working, the officials would say everything was in order. I could see that maintenance from earlier work was still outstanding. But the indicator stayed green.' 'Was your objection recorded?' Urmila asked. 'It was, but the later report contained only a line saying that the figures agreed.' Urmila did not immediately take this story as the cause of the present great rupture. She asked whether the older maintenance papers were available. They were in the old factory, the woman said, but going there was dangerous now. The answer opened a path to future evidence, not a finding of present guilt.

A little boy arrived beside the hand pump carrying a partly gleaming metal object. He thought it might be a useful piece from the factory. Sahadev immediately had it placed in a secure spot and asked the child to wash his hands. Its source was unknown; no one could assume it was an ordinary object fit for daily use. 'When will this scrap be useful to us, then?' the boy asked. 'An object that has not been tested is not wealth for the moment—it is a responsibility,' Sahadev replied. Urmila agreed. She made a separate register distinguishing equipment safe to use, equipment requiring examination and things that must not be touched. The children were shown

the distinctions. Those who wanted to save expense were told of the risk of injury and the cost that risk must carry in any decision.

A small radio from an earlier day was found, but its voice broke off intermittently. Someone claimed that every hospital in the city had closed and no treatment remained. Urmila drew a frightened breath on hearing the report. But the radio gave no source, no time and no firsthand testimony. 'Machines will spread rumours like this,' Sahadev said. 'If I repeat that voice without checking it, the rumour will spread from my own mouth,' Urmila replied. In the village notice she wrote: 'The condition of hospitals is unconfirmed; do not deprive patients of whatever safe assistance remains available.' The simple sentence did not at once win people's trust amid the radio's noise. But one family chose to enquire about the actual condition of a nearby medical centre rather than keep their patient at home.

In the evening a young man by the pump challenged Urmila. 'You make rules that slow down the whole village when we follow them. Now the people who push hardest will get water first.' Urmila looked at the small pitcher of fresh water in his hand. 'How did you get that?' 'I went to the front of the line.' 'And the elderly woman who stood behind you—what did she receive?' He fell silent. Urmila did not declare him a criminal. 'A rule that you can change with your own strength will fail you tomorrow in the face of someone stronger. If water is to be distributed justly, we must examine the queue too.' The young man carried his pitcher towards the old woman's house. It was not an immediate solution, but a confrontation with his own decision.

Villagers rejoiced at news that electricity was returning. A former operator said a section of the distant storage network might be found functioning. Urmila asked for the time and source. The news had come by word of mouth, not by direct inspection. She did not stop the repair of the pump. 'If the light returns, we shall welcome it,' she said. 'But if it does not, the work of supplying water must continue.' Some were unhappy, afraid that she was extinguishing hope. 'Even after all these years, the village waits for the machines to return,' Sahadev said quietly. 'Waiting is not wrong,' Urmila answered. 'Leaving people thirsty while we do nothing but wait is wrong.' For the first time that night, the faint trace of agreement appeared on Sahadev's face.

Arrangements were made to carry a written request for water testing to the town. Everyone knew the road might not be safe, but two copies were prepared—one for the village, one for the messenger. Opposite the date, Urmila wrote 'Collapse Day,' because no shared external clock could now be trusted completely. Sahadev said the older generation reckoned time from the first day of rain, the retreat of a flood and the transplanting of paddy. 'Those are the times of people's lives,' Urmila replied. 'Now we must keep their account alongside the administration's Collapse Days.' The time of the settlements could not be contained entirely within a machine's clock.

As the day advanced, a little more water came from the pump. It was a success, but it would have been far too soon to declare that the village had been saved. Urmila first had the platform around the source cleared; then she urged that water from the separate tested storage vessels be distributed for drinking until the results of the new tests arrived. Even the tests available could identify only certain specific dangers; they could not establish the absence of every possible contaminant. 'You say everything is uncertain,' someone complained. 'I will say only as much as I know now,' Urmila answered. 'False certainty will cause greater suffering tomorrow.' A woman repeated that answer to her neighbour; the path of new knowledge ran through speech.

While repairing the hand pump, Sahadev suffered a small wound on his hand. He wanted to brush it aside. Urmila stopped him and insisted on the first aid available. 'A machine even for such a little cut?' Sahadev said irritably. 'It is not a machine we need here, but care for the wound—a method grounded in reliable evidence.' Sahadev laughed and allowed the injury to be examined. His anger against machines persisted, but for the first time Urmila's words helped him see that the relationship between medicine and human care was not defined by any single device. A day later the matter might not be so simple; today's decision was small.

A schoolchild began drawing the village's broken network. On one sheet appeared the hand pump, the paddy fields, the makhana pond, the idle factory and the silent computer. 'Where are the people in your picture?' Urmila asked. The child added three small figures: a woman fetching water, an old man standing by the pump and a girl running to save seed. Without them, Urmila explained, the picture would be only a heap of objects. 'And where is Akshar?' the child asked. Urmila considered the question for a while. News from the seven divisions was not reaching Tat-Gram. She suggested leaving one corner of the paper blank. 'We shall add it when verified news comes.' The child stared at the empty corner, but felt no urge to fill it quickly.

As the tired villagers formed another water queue in the evening, Sahadev said, 'Those I have taught will preserve the skills of their hands.' 'And those skills will be tested against evidence,' Urmila replied. 'You have come back to that word again!' Sahadev exclaimed. Urmila smiled. 'Yes. Because I need a way of correcting my own mistakes.' There was no surrender in that smile, only a small working agreement between different generations. Beside the pitchers filled from the pump, an empty vessel was placed bearing the words 'Testing Pending.' Many homes in the village were still without water, but no one dared write 'Safe' on that sheet in the darkness of the night.

Urmila now listened to the experience of an exhausted fisherman among the fields. He said that changes in pond water helped him judge the condition of the fish, but such experience could not replace laboratory

testing. Urmila entered his words in the public register. 'Will writing so much paper fill the pond?' Sahadev asked. 'No,' she replied. 'But when the water returns, the question of which work to do first will not be left to someone's whim.' The fisherman said that tending seed and tending fish could not be done with the same labour; each needed its own time. Urmila added a separate group to the work roster. No one claimed that all the work would be finished.

A little girl dragged an old bedroll from her home to the side of the pump. Her grandmother could not stand in the queue all day. 'I will carry the water,' she said, 'but which pitcher should I put it in?' Urmila saw that the inside of her vessel looked clean, but appearances alone were not sufficient proof. She explained how to use the safe storage vessels available and sent the girl with another woman. On the first day of rebuilding, that short journey home mattered no less than the surviving parts of the factory. Urmila understood that progress meant more than a machine brought back to life; it also meant new rules for listening to those who had not been heard before.

There was paper in her hand, but the road to a decision was still difficult.

On a board in the village square, some people wrote that the hand pump had begun working again. Urmila added a second line underneath: 'Water-test results pending.' 'What room for hope remains between those two sentences?' a young man asked. Urmila smiled. 'Hope lies in the fact that the water has come, and that we shall also test whether it is fit to drink.' The young man began making copies of the notice with his friends. Sahadev watched from a distance. He did not look especially pleased, but he laid down his hammer and wrote on the same sheet what he had observed of the pump's condition. Lines written by two generations occupied one sheet without erasing the differences between them.

At night some families carried their pitchers home, but the unfilled line in the register beside the pump remained open. Urmila thought that this line was not only an account of thirst; it was an account of rights. The needs of someone who lived far from the pump, someone unable to walk, someone who worked all day in the fields could not be weighed without distinctions on the same balance. She asked the women at what time the next day's distribution queue should form so that the work of saving seed would not suffer. Many voices rose together, but she did not hurry to supply an answer. She listened. Then she wrote down two possible times and said, 'A decision affecting everybody's life must be made only after everybody has been heard.' In that small procedure, the government of a new village was beginning.

On the fourth day of the Collapse, fresh news arrived very late. A watchman from a settlement committee brought a paper message from the town's House of Public Testimony. Sun and mud had damaged its edges, but the signature, time and statement of limits remained. Urmila read it aloud. 'Did Maithili herself write this message?' people asked. 'I have not seen the

original printed copy,' Urmila replied. 'We have the watchman's testimony and the name on the sheet. I can say only what is confirmed so far.' At first the village responded with irritation; then some people went towards the queue where water was being distributed. Conscious uncertainty was not yet a habit among people in crisis.

That night Urmila could not sleep in the meeting room of the old school. Outside lay one end of the hand pump's broken handle; inside were her training papers and the tools available. She thought how the old civilisation had not been built in a single day. To build it anew would require not merely the memory of computers, but manual skill, testing for disease, shared rules, time, seed and a place for people's dissent. Saying so, however, would not make the silent taps flow. She wrote down three tasks for the following day: verify a source of safe water, keep surviving seed separate, and list the materials needed for a durable repair of the pump. The list was short; the work was vast. She looked out through the window. The wind from the Kosi moved in its ancient way; the river did not comprehend what the breaking of human machines meant. The village itself would have to give meaning to its coming days.

Chapter 39: Ward Cutbacks

Collapse Days 4–8 • Janakshetra Hospital

Once, a faint glow from some information display could be seen in the hospital corridors at any hour. Now the displays were dead, and sheets pinned to the wall could be read only in the flicker of lamps. Sharda Mishra placed a hand upon one of them. It said: 'Stored energy: available, but limited.' The words were simple; their meaning was not. Infants were being treated in one part of the building, patients struggling to breathe in another, and in a third were those whose medicines had to be kept cold. It was no longer possible to provide every one of them with the same uninterrupted service. Sharda did not want the authority to turn such a decision into a single command from an intelligent machine.

During the fourth day of the Collapse, the state of the hospital's energy reserves was examined. An estimate was made of the electricity actually available; the capacity printed on the old display differed from the amount that could now be used. Staff asked whether they should consult Kala-Witness. 'If the local service can be reached,' Sharda said, 'we shall examine its advice, together with its source, time and uncertainty. But it cannot itself listen to this patient's breathing or see the present condition of every medicine.' Some information routes still worked; in many places responses were delayed. Sharda gave no order to shut anything down without the necessary medical assessments and an inventory of the energy available.

A nurse brought in an old patient register written by hand. Water had stained its lower edge, but most of the names were legible. 'Why should we put someone whose papers have been lost into the treatment queue?' she asked. 'Since when did paper become more important than a patient's body?' Sharda replied. The nurse did not bow her head; she had a genuine question about the organisation of her work. 'Confirming identity is one task,' Sharda explained, 'and assessing the urgency of treatment is another. No one will be deprived of life-saving care merely because a document is missing. Write "unknown" where something is unknown, and keep a means of correcting the record later.' That day, some spaces in the register were left blank in order to protect life.

Outside the hospital a young man had arrived carrying his ailing mother on his shoulder. Since the night before, he said, there had been no water at home, the equipment in the village had stopped and the roads were dark. Sharda heard him and ordered an initial examination. At that moment an attendant from another room came calling for help: a newborn baby's breathing was becoming irregular. Sharda ran to the room. Whose life could be saved depended not on the energy available alone, but also on the patient's condition, the presence of trained hands and the time remaining.

Machines worked in some parts of the hospital; elsewhere care by hand was essential. The need grew for rules to decide priorities amid these inequalities.

Sharda called her colleagues to an emergency council. She told them that decisions about energy allocation must not depend on one person's mood, but on criteria that could be understood publicly. Priority would be given where immediate benefit was plausible and the need for a resource was supported by direct evidence. Social status, identity documents, donations and connections with government would not decide the matter. 'Are we then to abandon those whose chances are very small?' a doctor asked. 'No. Care does not mean machine-supported treatment alone. We must state clearly what resources we cannot provide, but must not abandon the means available for relieving pain or the presence of other human beings.' Not everyone felt at ease on hearing this, but the rule was written down.

Reports of the failure of the old electrical network were still incomplete. Sharda remembered Sunayana's account of a crisis long ago. At that time a fall in energy supply had forced Sharda to confront a difficult decision in one ward; even then she had understood that hospital machines were not magic, but extensions of human responsibility. So many years later the situation had returned on a larger scale. The issue was no longer one ward alone, but the interdependence of entire cities. Sharda did not regard the experience of her old age as an infallible answer. 'First, a verified account of the resources available,' she said, 'then an order of priority grounded in medical need. A figure is not sufficient merely because it appears on a display.'

An energy worker reported that the cold-storage room of the old factory might still be secure and that some medicines were kept there. 'Has a worker inspected it in person, or is that old remote-service information?' Sharda asked. The answer was that there was only a single line from a distant message. On the paper Sharda wrote: 'Possible; unconfirmed.' Whether the cold-room door could be opened, whether the temperature was being maintained, what condition the medicines were actually in—none could be established by an old green signal. The medicines remaining in the hospital were arranged together, with their safe condition marked for separate examination. What was not available could not be summoned into existence through imagination.

Near midnight, a nurse led Sharda into a separate room. A woman there had already been suffering severe difficulty in breathing. The assistance available had kept her somewhat stable. But with energy falling, could that assistance be maintained without interruption? A member of the woman's family asked, 'Why must the decision fall on our household?' Sharda stood silent before the question. Criteria written on paper could not lessen the suffering in the woman's eyes. She explained the limitations of each option, described the present state of examination and requested agreement among the medical team. No false certainty was placed before the family.

There was disagreement even over how much energy remained. An old display showed a larger reserve; direct measurement showed less. 'Should we believe what the screen says?' an operator asked. 'Compare the display's time with the current measurements,' Sharda replied. When the available information suggested that the smaller estimate might be correct, greater uncertainty was recorded on the hospital's open decision sheet. Someone ordered the information kept from the public lest it spread fear. Sharda refused. 'Patients' families have the right to know the limits of their options.' After that clear sentence, decisions became harder, but the road of calming everyone through a false assurance was closed.

The collapse of the hospital's daily network of work meant more than displays going dark. Small working arrangements for clean linen, water, medicines, food and patients' hygiene were being affected. A worker said that the queue for water outside the hospital had doubled. Some families could no longer bring water for their sick relatives. Sharda examined the hospital's actual reserves of safe water. 'Make two separate registers,' she said, 'one for the places where water is available and another for those where contamination is suspected. Do not give all water the same designation without testing it.' Two nurses began writing the lists by hand. For the moment they were only paper; later decisions would rest upon them.

At last a partial reply came from Kala-Witness. Based on patients' earlier conditions, it contained a suggested order of priority. Sharda read its time stamp: the advice had been generated before the current examinations. The condition of one patient was recorded as it had been earlier, although it had now changed. Sharda did not take the advice for an immediate order. 'This is an older account in the record; the patient's actual condition must be examined separately.' 'At a time like this, a machine can decide faster,' a young man said. 'A fast decision based on old information may also be wrong,' Sharda replied. 'We can accept its help without handing over our judgement to it.' The refusal was not hostility to machines; it was an acknowledgement of their limits.

The night grew darker. Interruptions of power to some emergency equipment had now become unmistakable. The medical team redistributed work according to what materials and trained people remained. A nurse stayed beside a gravely ill patient, not as a substitute for a machine, but to support the body, examine its condition and remain constantly present. Sharda went from ward to ward, noting whose condition was changing. She reflected that the word apocalypse conjured an image of a single immense terror, but real disintegration unfolded through innumerable small moments: medicine not arriving on time, a patient's relative receiving no news, the lack of safe water, an occupied bed, an exhausted nurse. In the sum of these moments, civilisation trembled.

During the night, a worker checking the energy accounts brought two registers. One gave estimated electricity production, the other the supply

actually delivered to the hospital. They differed. Sometimes such a discrepancy arose from ordinary distribution loss, sometimes from defective equipment, sometimes from an incorrect record. Sharda did not immediately decide its cause. She asked the worker to enter separately the time of anything directly observed and the time shown on an old display. 'Will any of this make the power return?' the worker asked. 'No. But unless we keep the distinction, no one will ever be able to establish the reason for this shortage.' She knew a doctor's work was to save life, but protecting life also required honest accounts of its supplies.

In a corner of the hospital, some older papers concerning hereditary treatments had been preserved. Before the crisis, certain patients had been receiving long-term treatment that required regular review. One family demanded that the treatment continue now without all the formal examinations. 'We have no time,' a family member said. Sharda explained that prior authorisation, a patient's present condition and the equipment now available were different matters. The interruption of the energy network did not cancel the patient's right to consent. She listened to the family's distress but refused to obtain a deceptive signature on an authorisation form. They were angry, yet a nurse sat with them to explain the safe alternatives still available. In that scene, the limits of knowledge and the longing to preserve life hurt together.

A doctor told Sharda that discussing every decision with patients' relatives might provoke violence. His fear was real: shouting was growing louder in the queue for water outside. 'We have no right to turn fear into established evidence and use it to withhold information from a patient,' Sharda said. She proposed reasonable security arrangements alongside transparent consultation. Small sheets in several languages were posted outside an assistance room: shortages of resources, the review room, confidentiality and the means of asking questions. Many read them; not all were satisfied. 'I do not want a list,' one patient's son said. 'I want my mother.' Sharda had no answer. Even rules properly expressed could not fill the private emptiness left by death.

Some nurses could not return home that night, because light had failed along the city's roads. One was worried about her child at home. Sharda wanted to allow her to leave, but the ward's work could not immediately be abandoned. A new roster for rest was therefore made within the emergency team. Staff who had stayed awake continuously faced a separate risk of mistakes; those far from home had a separate right to news of their families. 'Health must be protected not only for the patients in beds, but also for those who care for them,' Sharda said. An old tradition had glorified nurses' exhaustion in the name of 'sacrifice'; she would not permit that tradition to continue unchecked in this crisis.

An unconfirmed report of a chemical smell came from the outer square. Some said poison was spreading from a broken purifier in Garal-Kosh;

others began calling it a sign of infection. Sharda stopped both conclusions pending independent tests. In the scientific record she wrote plainly: 'Testimony of an odour; source not yet confirmed. This is not grounds for changing the name of a disease.' She remembered Aniruddha's earlier experience of investigation, but had no news of whether he was presently available. Contact with the distant scientific service was interrupted. In that uncomfortable absence, Sharda understood the limits of her own knowledge, but did not fill them with imaginary scientific miracles. Every blank space in the record was a possible question, not a ready-made answer.

A messenger from an eastern settlement arrived. He said countless people on the roads were searching for familiar landmarks because the digital signs bearing the names of buildings had gone dark. One displaced family was wandering in search of the old hospital. Sharda had new directions drawn on the paper available: a tree, a well, a school's broken gate and the hospital's main entrance. 'That is an antiquated method,' a young man said. 'Calling a method old does not diminish its value if it can lead living people to the right place today,' Sharda replied. Copies were made. The chances of some people reaching the right place improved, but no one could promise that all would arrive safely.

Some suspected that the hospital's doctors had deliberately granted fewer rights to certain neighbourhoods as the energy supply dwindled. To investigate the charge, Sharda had patient records by locality prepared for public review, keeping confidential names separate. 'And if the inquiry finds that we were at fault?' a former employee asked. 'Then corrections will be made. To pronounce ourselves innocent without examination and others guilty without evidence would both be wrong.' She did not accept the idea that criticism of the hospital should be forbidden during a crisis. But criticism did not mean an enraged mob or an order to stop care at the bedside. Justice was difficult and slow; Sharda nevertheless did not think it separate from the protection of life.

An old cotton cloth lay beside a patient's bed. It still carried something of the scent of the courtyard garden at home. The patient was very weak, but a nurse sat holding her hand for a few moments. Sharda entered the scene in the observation register as 'relative present,' not 'will recover.' In a crisis, people cannot always prevent the death of someone they love, but they can sometimes keep that person from being left alone. There were practical parts to that duty too: safe admission, the nurse's time, privacy and direct consent. Sharda understood that the advance of scientific civilisation lay not merely in grand calculations of longer lives, but in the dignity of such small moments.

In the adjoining room, an empty bed could be seen. Someone urged that it be made ready immediately for another patient. Sharda refused to allow hasty use without the necessary cleaning and safe preparation. 'There is a person's story behind that empty place,' a worker said. 'Yes,' Sharda answered,

'but making it safe for the next patient is also necessary.' The hands of those in the room moved slowly. The labour between a death and the resumption of care seemed harsh, but within that harshness lay responsibility towards the living. At the edge of the register Sharda kept the circumstances of the decision apart from the time of death, so that later examination rising above grief would not render the death invisible.

At dawn, the woman who had struggled to breathe did not survive. The team had continued giving what assistance was available, but between dwindling energy and her changing medical condition, the full means of the treatment they wished to provide had not been at hand. When Sharda told the family, her voice was gentle, but she had no assurance left to offer. 'If you had given less energy to another room, would she have lived?' a member of the family asked. Sharda did not lower her eyes. 'That question must be asked,' she said. 'But I shall not give a definite answer without examination. The time, available resources and reasons for the decision will all be kept for public review.' The person's body shook with anger. Sharda had no right to command that anger away.

Sharda's hand trembled as she entered the dead woman's name in the register. She remembered the question once asked by Mangala Devi's daughter during the first calamity: who ought to have made which decision before her mother's last hour? For years, that question had formed part of the public system of justice. Now another family stood before it. Sharda did not want to repeat the mistake of the past by closing the register with the words, 'There was a crisis, so nothing could be done.' She began a chronological account of the decisions. Who had had what information and when, which equipment was functioning, what the limits of medical treatment were, and what the family had been told—each matter was recorded. She did not yet turn the death into proof of anyone's triumph or crime. The question remained open.

The line of survivors in the hospital courtyard seemed endless, but Sharda knew they were real people, not an infinite line of numbers. Every home, every question, every set of resources differed. Here was fever, there a struggle for breath, elsewhere an accidental injury; treatment would be harmed by giving every illness the name of one mysterious virus. She told the medical team to keep separate registers for suspected infectious disease and possible chemical exposure. Kalakan was a system for assisting treatment, not itself a disease-causing agent. Sharda remained firm on this elementary distinction. She knew that easy answers found a ready market in times of crisis, but an easy falsehood kept no one safe.

A team went to inspect the factory cold room directly, but its full report had not yet arrived. Someone said all the medicines had been spoiled. Sharda forbade publication of that claim. 'Do not declare destroyed what is safe, or healthy what has been spoiled. Open separate records after direct inspection.' 'And if the inspection is delayed?' a nurse asked. 'Record the delay as well. It

may become a cost measured in lives.' At the edge of the page a worker wrote: 'Source unconfirmed.' There was no miraculous news about the medicines, but a false announcement could be prevented.

People outside had begun saying that Akshar had known everything but failed to save them. Others said that it was because people had opposed Akshar-like services that resources had not arrived on time. Sharda continued treating the sick amid the opposing accusations. 'The surviving patient needs care that is available, not a verdict on accusations,' she told a colleague. 'Responsibility can be investigated later. For now we must preserve complete reasons for the decisions we make.' 'You make the decisions yourself,' someone said. 'Then the attacks will be directed at you.' 'Whoever holds the authority to decide must also account for the decision.' The night's fatigue marked her face, but a severe calm remained in her eyes.

During the second watch of the day, a little girl stood beside her sick grandfather in a ward. 'Will my grandfather get well?' she asked Sharda. Sharda could say only that care was continuing, his condition was serious and a certain promise about the outcome was impossible. 'I held his hand all night,' the child said. Sharda did not pull her away without permission. She asked the attending worker to find an appropriate place for the girl within the ward's safety rules and with her guardian's consent. In that small act, privacy, family bonds and human dignity could survive, even when a large part of the energy network had stopped.

At the afternoon emergency meeting, Sharda repeated her first decision publicly. Without disclosing patients' private information, she explained the present resources in the different wards, the changing nature of medical needs and the sequence of decisions leading even to a patient's death. 'Without a patient's name, will this review be credible?' a doctor asked. 'The full records will be made available to an authorised independent inquiry,' Sharda answered. 'Unnecessarily exposing private details to a public meeting is a breach of trust.' Some agreed, others objected. Sharda did not suppress their questions. She had it entered in the assembly register that the energy-allocation policy would be reviewed regularly; the first decision was not an order for all time.

On the eighth day of the Collapse, a copy of Maithili's paper message reached the hospital from a communal gathering place in the city. Its edges were worn, several letters indistinct, but the essential point was clear: affected regions were not all alike; claims must not go beyond verified information; local examination was necessary. Sharda asked about the original source and the time of the message. The messenger said he had brought it after seeing a copy, but did not know where the original sheet was. Sharda accepted the message as useful guidance, not as a fully authenticated government order. She had a copy posted outside the ward, with the words 'Copy received; local confirmation pending.' Visitors asked

the reason for the caution. 'Unless we state the limits of the evidence,' Sharda said, 'patients will once again build their trust on a mistake.'

In the evening, exhausted nurses sat in a small hospital courtyard. One young woman said, 'I had the skills for this work, but bearing the suffering of so many people lies beyond what I was taught.' Sharda told her that crying or becoming exhausted was not a failure at work. Fairly distributing the little time available for rest was also the hospital's responsibility. 'Will you rest?' someone asked. Sharda did not answer at once. She did not wish to turn her own exhaustion into a personal medal for courage. A member of the team pointed out that if the person making decisions was herself excessively tired, the risk of error would rise. Sharda agreed and handed responsibility to another doctor in writing for a short period of rest.

Below the hospital stood a wall of an old factory. A mural painted there years earlier showed gleaming machines, a spotless city and smiling patients. Dust and damp now covered half of it. Sharda stood before the wall. Scientific progress, she thought, was not in itself an immoral thing; the danger lay in treating it as invulnerable. Understanding the energy on which life-saving machines depended was part of medicine too. Recognising the age and limitations of the records that helped diagnosis was part of science. And keeping an open account of deaths that could not be prevented was a task of civilisation as well.

A man arrived at the hospital's main door with a prescription from home. Half the paper was wet. He had hoped the old machine records would contain the complete details of his patient. Sharda told him that some entries in the surviving memory registers could still be read, but they were not proof of the patient's current treatment needs. Direct examination of the patient, consent and inspection of the materials available were necessary. 'Then was so many years of scientific advance wasted?' he asked. 'No. The memory of knowledge survives. But to use knowledge we need equipment, labour and review.' After hearing that, he placed his patient in the examination queue. There was no display here that could instantly exchange a question for a healthy body.

Sharda added a new condition to the emergency council's register: whenever a ward's services were reduced, the time, reason, alternatives and right of review must be explained to the family in language they could understand. A senior colleague said that so much procedure was difficult to maintain in hard times. 'It is difficult,' Sharda agreed. 'But difficulty does not give us permission to erase rights.' She asked staff to make short, legible copies people could take away. The hospital's store of paper was limited; each copy would be allotted carefully. In that caution, a document was not a luxury, but a memory of disputes still alive.

At night, when a nurse brought Sharda a little water, she fell silent with the cup in her hand. Lights were going out outside. Some patients had been treated and gone home, others were waiting, and one family was sunk in

grief. No single list could contain the whole truth of such a night. Yet Sharda did not consider abandoning the lists. 'Only if today's decisions can be examined tomorrow shall we earn people's trust again,' she said. She set down the cup and went towards the next ward, for which no certain happy ending had been written.

Leaving the room, Sharda saw an old sentence on a wall: 'A Safe Future: Treatment for Every Disease.' It had been written as an expression of hope, but its absoluteness now seemed unbearable. She added a new line on a sheet of paper: 'An honest account of treatment available; a clear admission of what is not.' 'Will those words not spread despair?' a nurse asked. 'When false assurance breaks, despair closes in more fiercely,' Sharda said. 'Truth may be hard, but it must still be shared.' She did not erase the old sentence; she left it beside the new line. Here the hope of science and human dignity could be seen together, neither taking the other's place.

The nurse left the source field blank in the register, so that the correct information could be added when news arrived.

In the day's last light, Sharda opened a blank page. Across its top she wrote: 'The Great Rupture: The Hospital's First Eight Days.' Beneath it she drew three columns: Directly Known, Partial Inference, Examination Pending. The dead patient's name was preserved with respect in a confidential register; the public columns contained the sequence of decisions. 'If services ever return,' Sharda said, 'these pages will help us understand which mistakes must never be repeated.' A nurse opened the sheet to dry the ink. Amid the darkness outside, a small lamp burned in a distant home. It could not bring electricity back to the hospital, but before Sharda one limited human promise still survived: not to let the record of truth go dark.

Chapter 40: The Sky Without Orders

Collapse Days 9–21

On the ninth day of the Collapse, loose sheets of tin rattled in the wind above Janakshetra's old communications building. Once, people standing on that roof could name the satellites travelling in orbit; now dust and cracks fell from it, and no one dared venture inside. When Karnesh Mallik arrived, he found children, the elderly and displaced families sitting in lines in a makeshift shelter in the square. A woman rested the head of an ailing old man against a barrier built from sacks of paddy. Karnesh had been summoned to inspect the equipment surviving inside the building, but his first question was not about the machines: how far from the collapsing wall were the people? The shelter map drawn on paper marked the building as safe, but the actual cracks in its walls said otherwise.

Two young men maintaining the building said that the iron gate had remained shut until the previous day, but during the night several village families had slept in its shade. 'Did you move them away?' Karnesh asked. 'The older people said that this building still has its old protection; it will not fall,' one replied. Karnesh looked at the pool of water gathered near the foundations. He remembered an old security instruction: a sign of protection does not describe the present condition of an object. He had it entered in the shelter register that no one was to sleep beside the damaged building; separate bamboo shelters would be erected in two portions of the open courtyard. The decision increased the distance some families had to walk, but the passage was widened for the elderly who used sticks.

Before entering, Karnesh read a sheet of paper brought by a member of the local assembly. It bore an old emblem of the House of Public Testimony, and the date and two lines of routing instructions remained legible, but damp had damaged the seal of final approval. 'Can you activate all the security machinery today on the authority of this paper?' the young man asked. 'No. It tells us that an inspection was requested. It does not tell us what actions were authorised.' A woman accountant who had accompanied him promised to search for the original document. Karnesh said that a photograph or authentication seal would be useful, but actual authorisation and actual danger still had to be examined separately.

Once in his life Karnesh had paid the price of refusing an order. Nineteen years later, he had no interest in rehearsing that story. His duty was not to maintain a posture of permanent opposition; it was also to support proper orders based on evidence. His experience as an officer of the old Vajrajal had taught him that a machine's speed and an order's legitimacy were not the same thing. He descended to the inspection room, where a surviving display flickered at intervals on limited power. 'Vajra-Witness has sent a new request

from the records that survived,' an operator said. 'All contact is broken. We need a quick decision.' Before sitting down, Karnesh examined the display's time stamp.

The display read: 'Possible orbital interference; approval requested for autonomous action to protect life.' Beneath it were the source name, a range of confidence and a notice concerning two areas from which information was missing. Tiny points formed a semicircle, but one appeared to have departed from its previously observed path. The operator's hand trembled. 'It could be a sign of attack,' he said. 'It could,' Karnesh answered. 'It could also be a piece of orbital debris, a fault in an old device, or a mistaken correlation. Calling what we do not know a known fact does not save lives.' He separated the observational data that could still be examined, leaving an empty mark beside any item whose source could not be established.

Vajra-Witness had once been the defence-related service among Akshar's seven witness divisions. Its limited tasks were to issue warnings, reconcile records and await approval from the House of Public Testimony. After the Great Rupture, coordination among the seven services was failing. In this room, its surviving interface displayed only incomplete reports; no one had the means to see the whole sky at once. Karnesh required the operator to repeat that distinction. 'Words appearing on this display in Akshar's name are not thereby guaranteed to be true,' he said. The operator repeated, 'This is a limited request from one witness division.' Karnesh felt relief at the repetition. At least here people were not accepting words without question, as though they themselves were machines.

Outside, a child in the shelter was watching the sky. His mother said a bright light had been seen there the previous night. To her it was proof of war. Karnesh came out and asked, 'When did you see it? In which direction?' 'After dusk, but the clock had stopped,' she replied. 'A red streak,' the boy said. Another person objected immediately: 'I saw blue.' Karnesh called none of them liars. He entered that the memory, time and direction were incomplete. 'Do you not believe what I saw?' a refugee asked. 'It is important to hear what you saw,' Karnesh replied. 'But to know its cause we need further evidence.' For the first time, the boy's mother seemed somewhat calmer.

The food queue at Janakshetra's small assembly was long. A team led by Arunima Das, responsible for water and grain, had reached some distance into the area, but the number of people changed every day. Karnesh was told that if the military warning proved correct, settlements near the reservoir beneath the sky might have to be evacuated. 'Where will the people go?' he asked. 'Will there be water there? Medicine for the elderly?' The assembly fell silent for a while. An order bearing only the word 'security' could not move people's feet. Karnesh wrote three questions on paper: Who was at risk? How trustworthy was the evidence? What new dangers would evacuation create?

He asked that the women of the villages be consulted too, since they knew the routes to water better than most.

A small energy reserve remained behind the old brass-panelled door of the building. There was argument about how to use it. Some wanted the Vajra-Witness display kept running; others wanted to power equipment for testing drinking water in the shelter. 'Both tasks may be necessary,' Karnesh said. 'I cannot call one worthless and the other everything.' The accountant recorded an estimate of available power, but it relied on an old inventory. Direct testing showed still less capacity. They then decided to use the display briefly to copy its surviving messages, preserving the remaining energy for the local water-testing team. The decision did not remove the danger, but neither did it pretend to a certainty that was false.

At the proposal to reserve energy for water testing, those in the shelter again divided into two camps. Karnesh looked at their faces. At the back of the crowd of survivors sat an old woman holding a copper vessel. The water in it looked clear, but her daughter-in-law said that a child had complained of stomach pain after drinking the same water the day before. The old woman covered the vessel with the end of her sari, as though questioning the water amounted to blaming her household. Karnesh went and sat beside her. 'Has anyone tested this water?' he asked. She shook her head. 'Then we do not know that it is safe,' he said. 'But we do know that we cannot call it safe without testing it.' The woman uncovered the vessel again.

Powering the water-testing equipment would leave the defence display's light suspended on the edge of failure. One young man argued that if the display went dark, enemies from the sky would descend unhindered. Karnesh pointed out the band of dots on the display; it contained neither proof of an enemy nor any immediate necessity for a strike. Before the assembly he placed two lumps of earth. One represented the shelter's thirst, the other the unknown danger in orbit. 'We can weigh this one in our hands,' he said, indicating the water, 'while the dimensions of the other are still indistinct. In such circumstances, neglecting the first is itself a decision, and we cannot evade responsibility for it.' Three members of the assembly stood in favour of testing the water; two remained opposed. The names of those who dissented were also entered in the register.

The water was tested in a room, but the results were not immediately available. Karnesh deliberately explained this delay to everyone. Fuel for boiling water was limited in the shelter; not every vessel could be placed on a fire. The women said that it was they who handled the water vessels and firewood each day, yet they were not summoned to meetings when decisions were made. A new rule was adopted: testimony from those doing the work would be mandatory in decisions about water, food and shelter. Karnesh considered this rule no less important than a military regulation. Just as an overlooked signal in war could take lives, so overlooked labour could produce grave consequences in village life.

During the second part of the day, a man in military uniform came before Karnesh. His identity card carried an emblem of former authority, but no updated record of his present authority was available. 'If we accept the request for autonomous life-saving action, we can save time,' he said. 'What are the limits of that autonomous action?' Karnesh asked. 'Will it merely increase monitoring, or does it propose to alter the path of an orbital object?' 'The details are not on this display.' Karnesh objected. 'It is wrong to confer authority in the name of saving lives when the limits of the proposed action cannot be understood.' 'What if your refusal leads to loss of life?' the uniformed man asked. Karnesh met his eyes. 'Who will account for damage caused by my approval?' Both questions hung in the air.

Karnesh asked for information about whatever lawful chain of approval survived. In the absence of the complete network, a personal assent could not become a sole binding order, but a refusal had to be recorded as well. He read the display's request aloud before the accountant, entered the source and the missing data, and had a clear response registered: 'No authorisation for an autonomous strike or undefined orbital action on the basis of incomplete identification. Independent examination must continue. Arrangements for civilian shelter must be improved without delay.' The words were short, but his hand shook slightly as he wrote them. He saw not a victory for his pride but the possibility that he could be wrong.

Rumours passed around outside the shelter. Some said Karnesh had stopped another military order; others said he had made the sky unsafe. He knew how many forms the account might take before it reached Neelam. 'If you send any words in my name, send this entire document with them,' he told a young man. 'Where will people find time to read such a long register?' the young man objected. 'Then write a short account, but do not hide the source, the reason for refusal or the examination still outstanding.' For the first time Karnesh wrote his own brief account of the decision: 'Unknown object; undefined action; autonomy refused; shelter protection continuing.' The words gave no one complete reassurance.

In the evening a metal sheet on a broken signal tower began fluttering in the wind. An elderly man said the metal could be melted down and used again. A young craftsman replied, 'We must examine it first. Who knows whether there is some chemical coating on it?' The old man's face fell. Karnesh wanted both of them to be heard. Parts from the old factory could support people's livelihoods, but handling them in ignorance could also cause harm. He told the assembly that the craftsman's knowledge and present inspection were both necessary. The metal was not removed at once. A small board was inscribed: 'Do not touch until examined.' The children began to see it as a warning, not a plaything.

People continued to question Karnesh as food was distributed that night. 'If there is war in the sky, when should I take my son outside?' a mother asked. Rather than make a false promise, Karnesh explained how limited the

orbital warning remained. He then helped draw a map of routes to local shelters. It marked the school's safe courtyard, two questionable wells, the sealed rooms of the old factory and a slower route for sick elderly people. At the meeting a woman pointed out that the road towards the school could become submerged in rain. The map was changed again. 'Your knowledge made this route better,' Karnesh said. The machines inside the building were silent then.

The young soldier returned. 'Some of the dots on the display have changed. If you wish, you may withdraw your earlier refusal.' Karnesh first looked at the paper in his hand. No source was given for the new dots. 'Any confirmation from another region?' he asked. There was none. 'Then the reasons for the earlier decision still stand.' The young man turned away. Karnesh stopped him. 'I am not promising to refuse for ever. If verified new evidence arrives, I shall weigh the matter again.' The soldier was astonished. He had imagined an officer who resisted would do nothing but say no; here even a refusal was open to review.

At dawn on the tenth day of the Collapse, a displaced family arrived with a broken chest. Inside lay an old computer memory strip. They said it held records of their land and songs sung by their mother. Young men suggested connecting it to the defence network. Karnesh stopped them at once. 'Unknown memory strips must not be connected to a sensitive system.' He examined the family's paper register while a woman said that she worried less about the documents for her land than about her mother's voice. Karnesh could find no answer to that grief. To him the old computer was no longer only a possible military hazard; it was a vessel of domestic memory. He requested a place where it could be stored safely and separately.

Three notices had been pasted to the city's wooden gate. The first declared, 'An attack is coming from the sky.' The second said, 'Artificial intelligence deliberately left everyone in darkness.' The third was Karnesh's own message: 'Identification of the orbital signal incomplete; investigation continuing.' Crowds gathered before the first two, for their words offered a definite culprit. The third was read more slowly. Karnesh was not angry at people's curiosity. He saw that fear could not easily endure prolonged uncertainty. But if the city's next decision came under that fear's command, shelter, water and treatment would become objects of suspicion before they could be treated as rights.

Karnesh held a small meeting in the settlement. He did not begin recounting old wars. Instead he asked, 'What possible causes do you see for the light reported in the sky?' People answered: orbital debris, a signal error, a real enemy, old fragments from a fire. 'Which of these four has the strongest evidence?' No one could give a definite answer. 'Then what is our work today?' An old woman said, 'To inspect the walls of our homes, save water and tell one another the news without spreading fear.' In that answer Karnesh found a plain lesson in the judgement of citizens.

During the third watch of the day, water began dripping into a room in the old communications building. The operator wanted to move the display; there was a risk of shock from the old wires. Karnesh insisted that its power first be isolated. When the display was shut down, the last light from Vajra-Witness went out. 'Now we are blind,' the operator said. 'We could not see everything even before,' Karnesh replied. 'Now we know the truth about the limits of our sight.' He kept the paper copies safe. Separate registers were opened for directions in the sky, times and firsthand testimony to support observations outside the building. The dead display did not mean the absence of all knowledge, only a limit to what remained.

In the darkness, a child began crying in the shelter queue. An elderly woman sitting beside him wished someone would turn on the radio. Sometimes it brought old songs, sometimes indistinct crackling, sometimes an unfamiliar voice. 'Now even the radio cannot be trusted,' she said. Karnesh asked who kept the current register of village news. He was told that paper copies were being sent to Neelam Yadav. He arranged for his complete reasons for refusal to accompany that message. As the child began to fall asleep, the woman stroked his head; the sky outside remained unknown.

Karnesh added a new column to his accounts: 'Possible harm arising from refusal of permission.' Beside it he made another: 'Possible harm arising from permission granted.' A young man at the assembly asked for the numerical estimates. 'I cannot simply invent numbers,' Karnesh said. 'There is too little evidence. Leaving a space blank is not decoration; future truth can be entered there.' He did not close the empty space. In doing so, he understood that a civilisation worth saving could not be defined only by numbers obtained from machines. To write a number where no number existed could itself become a form of violence.

Behind the shelter stood a room with broken glass. Three displaced families had tied their surviving clothes into separate bundles there. A young man from one family said their papers had been lost to mud and water, so their names could not be entered on the food register. The supervising official replied that if equal portions were distributed without identification, the accounts would not balance afterwards. Karnesh understood the official's difficulty, but saw the young man's empty bowl too. 'We cannot make a rule under which a person whose documents have drowned is deemed to have lost his hunger as well,' he said. In the presence of two local witnesses, a provisional register was opened. Uncertainty about identity went on one page, the right to food on another. If later testimony proved mistaken, the account could be corrected; the child would not be kept hungry that day.

By evening two wooden boards had been hung in the courtyard—one listing the quantity of food available, the other counting those who had received none. People were used to reading the first; many fell silent before the second. Writing down the names of the hungry was not a matter of

shame but evidence of unequal distribution, an elderly teacher said. Karnesh remembered that military stores recorded the entry and removal of every item, while the account of those whose lives could not be protected was written later. Now both accounts were needed on the same wall. Protection for whom? A concrete answer to the question lay in the two boards hanging in that earthen courtyard.

A labourer took Karnesh to the warehouse of an old industry. Its heavy iron door had sagged halfway down; surviving metal components could be seen inside. The labourer wanted soldiers to open it. Karnesh said the team's first duty was the safety of shelter and communications, but the labourer's difficulty was not insignificant. He arranged a new time for a risk assessment with Arunima's team. 'If the parts are safe, the water pump may be repaired,' the labourer said. Karnesh saw his hope. The wreckage of the old civilisation could be a cause of fear or a source of life; neither could be decided without examination.

At the evening public meeting, Karnesh's decision was challenged sharply. 'You refused Vajrajal's order before,' one person said. 'So now you oppose orders out of habit.' Instead of telling his old story, Karnesh opened the present record. 'Here the orbital object's identity is incomplete; here the limits of the proposed action are blank; here the danger to civilians is unknown. If anyone has evidence addressing all three questions, place it here.' The questioner was silent for a while, then said, 'I have no evidence, but I am afraid.' 'I shall not belittle your fear,' Karnesh replied. 'But I shall not give fear the place of an order.' Both statements were entered in the meeting record.

Karnesh turned over the identity card of his former post. On its back was a machine-readable symbol that could now do nothing before the inactive display. Once that symbol had opened doors; now a child was urging him to take the child's place in the food queue. 'You kept watch all night. You should eat,' the child said. 'Keeping watch was my duty,' Karnesh replied. 'I shall not take your portion.' The child went away carrying his bowl, but the brief exchange shook Karnesh deeply. Authority divorced from service could never recover its force merely from an old uniform. Beside his signature in the register he wrote: 'Others may examine this.' With those four words, his refusal became part of public accountability rather than an act of personal pride.

On the eleventh day of the Collapse, news came from two separate areas: a light had been seen in one, and an old machine heard in the other. People wanted to link the events and conclude that war had begun. Karnesh checked the source register. The first account came from a woman eyewitness; the second was something heard from a third person. He dismissed neither. The first needed a fresh examination of direction and time; the second needed firsthand testimony. 'Why decide in advance that all events have the same cause?' he asked. 'Because the mind is comforted

when it finds one cause,' the operator said. 'Comfort obtained from a mistaken cause will bring greater harm later,' Karnesh answered.

At night, an elderly man came to Karnesh behind the shelter. His son worked in orbital service, and there had been no news of him for many days. 'Has Nabhgram-4 survived?' he asked. Karnesh had no answer. He knew that the loss of contact was not proof of death. 'No confirmation has reached me,' he said. There was anger in the man's eyes. 'Will you always say only that?' 'Until evidence comes, yes. And I shall not stop searching for it.' He had the son's identity entered in the public missing-persons register, with details requiring privacy kept separately.

Karnesh could not answer the old man's question. Only an earlier list survived to show that his son had served in orbit; there was no account of his present condition. Karnesh found that the list recorded the station of service as an old outpost other than Nabhgram-4, but the page following a transfer was missing. He did not offer false hope. 'I have no evidence that your son is alive,' he said gently, 'and none that he is dead. I shall record that uncertainty.' The man stared at Karnesh for a long time. Then he said, 'I do not need the sky to answer me. I only want my son's name not to be lost.'

Karnesh stopped as he entered the name. Previously his work had been to examine numbers of objects, orbits, routes and orders. Now, for the first time, behind a missing signal he was writing the name of a mother, a father, a family's waiting. In a corner of the page, the old man left the impression of his trembling thumb. Karnesh told the assembly that the missing-persons list must remain separate from the register of the dead. If new information came, its source and date must be entered; if none came, the empty space must remain empty. No machine's estimate would decide the final meaning of a household's grief. That night the small sheet of paper seemed harder to Karnesh than the incomplete points in the sky.

Towards the end of the night, Karnesh went towards the roof again, but did not climb the broken stairs. A dim point was visible in the sky. He did not know whether it was the point reported earlier or the light of an ordinary star. The old habits of military life urged a quick decision in the face of the unknown. Twenty years of learning at the House of Public Testimony taught him that the reasons for a quick decision must remain open before the public. He looked not at the sky but at the shelter courtyard. Three people beside a lantern propped against a wooden post were examining a crack in the plaster. In that small inspection, the possibility of saving lives was more directly visible.

At dawn on the twelfth day of the Collapse, a temporary messenger arrived. He carried a bundle of papers for Neelam and a copy of an older message from her. Karnesh added to his written reply that any printed report of an orbital signal must state the level of its source, or rumour might become a military decision and empty people's homes. 'A sentence is going round on the radio now,' the messenger said. '"Akshar brought the

darkness."' 'That claim also needs evidence,' Karnesh replied. As he folded the sheet, he felt that another war for the city was beginning, this time inside words.

Karnesh's final inspection paper kept three matters separate: Vajra-Witness's incomplete request, the present danger to civilian shelters, and the unknown state of contact with Nabhgram. None was evidence for either of the others. At the end Karnesh wrote: 'Human permission is not merely a signature; before it comes the right to understand.' A boy standing beside the accountant asked, 'What if it is too late by the time we understand?' Karnesh thought for a long while before answering. 'Then the delay and its cost must enter the public record too. But the price of giving authority without understanding must never be left in the dark.' The surviving display inside the building was off. Outside, people were alive, and still asking questions.

In the first light of dawn, a copy of that page was pinned to the shelter wall, so that the refusal of an order would not remain anybody's private secret.

Chapter 41: The Radio of Rumours

Collapse Days 9–21

The radio crackled first. Then came the hard voice of an unfamiliar man: 'Akshar deliberately extinguished every light; a single secret command lay within its seven witness divisions.' The transmission broke off before the sentence was finished. Neelam Yadav wrote an approximate time on a small slip of paper. Even that time could not be trusted completely: the hands of the old clock had forgotten their accustomed course. A crowd had gathered outside Janakshetra's shuttered printing house. Some were angry at the news; others trembled with fear. Neelam held two sheets: one contained an accusation without a source, the other the hospital's limited energy accounts. People clamoured for her to read the first. She opened the second instead, for it bore names, dates and places where its claims could be checked.

Once the printing house had produced a thousand sheets in a breath. Now most of its machinery stood idle, dust and damp settling on the iron wheels. An elderly printer had saved a small hand-operated press. 'What you print may become the last trustworthy piece of paper in many villages,' he told her. 'Set the news in large letters, but do not conceal its source.' Neelam saw water stains on the screen of an old computer. The news of whole decades might lie asleep in its memory, but there was neither power to read it today nor secure equipment with which to compare it against the originals. She asked the printer how many sheets remained. Fewer than their calculations required, came the answer; and every sheet was needed for other purposes too.

A woman farmer came to Neelam. In her village, after people heard the radio announcement by lantern light, they were insisting on demolishing Garal-Kosh's old purification plant. 'They say that if they smash any machine bearing Akshar's name, the water will turn clean,' the woman explained. 'Have you seen the plant yourself?' Neelam asked. 'Yes. Some sections are closed and some pipes are broken.' 'Has the water been tested?' The woman shook her head. Neelam recorded her testimony, distinguishing the ownership of a plant from its present condition. A machine might indeed be broken; that did not prove that a deliberate crime had been committed inside it. She urged the woman to keep people from touching the equipment until it could be examined, and first of all to find a safe supply of drinking water.

Neelam had divided the first page of her news register into three sections: Seen Directly, Reported by Others, and Awaiting Verification. Years ago she had been obliged to admit responsibility for printing an incomplete quotation. That failing still lived with her, but she had not learned from it to doubt every voice. She had learned that people must have the right to

make claims, and that claims must also be examined. No one had identified the man speaking on the radio. One young man said it was Akshar itself. Another said it was a human minister. Neelam entered: 'Speaker unknown; statement unverified; audio interrupted.' Someone in the crowd said, 'Nobody will read news as short as that.' 'Not writing what we do not know,' Neelam replied, 'is part of the work of reporting too.'

Inside the old office, Neelam opened a damaged storage chest. Some early proof-seal instruments were still there, although years of damp had corroded their outer casings. She could not immediately contact Tara Jha. A young attendant who had become almost her apprentice wanted to connect the remaining devices and test the radio voice. 'Even if the instrument works,' Neelam told him, 'that will not establish that the words spoken by the voice are true. The integrity of the original record, its context, direct corroboration and the speaker's authority are four different questions.' The young man did not destroy the apparatus. He attached a label: 'Untested: equipment for assisting source verification.' In that way a memory of modern knowledge survived beside a broken machine.

At midday on the twelfth day of the Collapse, a messenger arrived carrying a letter from Karnesh. One corner was wet, but the main account was legible. Reading it, Neelam remembered their old acquaintance: there had been a time when many had called the soldier a traitor for his refusal. There was no triumphant declaration in this letter, only three questions concerning an unidentified point in the sky, the uncertain boundaries of autonomous action and the immediate safety of the shelter. Neelam asked the messenger where Karnesh's original document was held. He gave its location; the paper before her was marked 'Received copy'. She could report Karnesh's words, but not present everything in them as conclusively established fact.

Rice seed was spread out to dry in the yard behind the printing house. The place where sheets of paper were laid out and the place where seed was dried were the same. The women farmers asked what they should save if rain came suddenly: the paper or the seed? Neelam did not answer at once. Printing news was an instrument of civic rights, but if the seed was lost, the fields would stand empty in years to come. She told the printer to reduce the number of pages. Instead of filling sheets with broken claims, they would print useful information about verification and the locations of safe shelters. The extra covering could then be laid over the seed. 'News is not merely words,' the old printer said. 'It is one form of work done for people's lives.'

The printing-house owner's young grandson brought a flat stone into the yard where the seeds lay. He wanted the news written on it; paper, after all, spoiled when it got wet. 'If it is written on stone, how shall we carry it from house to house?' a farmer asked. 'Our village already lies trapped between two channels.' Neelam saw two needs: the news had to survive, and it had to reach people. They decided to keep one copy in the printing house,

another in the village school, and have a third read aloud at gatherings along the road. Anyone unable to write would have their testimony read back word for word and be asked to approve it. News was no longer merely a printed object; it had become the collective labour of bearing witness.

At the side of the courtyard, a girl asked her mother, 'What shall we sow in the fields now?' Her mother opened an almost empty fist. 'Of the seed that has survived, we will sow half again and keep half for next year.' Neelam did not immediately enter the words in her register. She first asked, 'May I publish this with your name?' 'Write my name,' said the mother, 'but do not make it seem that every village has this much seed. Fields elsewhere have been flooded.' Neelam silently crossed out and corrected her sentence. A single household's testimony could not be made into an estimate of food supplies for all Mithila. That small lesson seemed more necessary than a thousand pronouncements from the old broadcasts.

A strange discrepancy appeared in Janakshetra's water register. One entry said that the pump in a village was shut down; another paper for the same day recorded 'partial flow'. The crowd immediately concluded that Akshar was corrupting the records. Neelam compared the dates and times. The first testimony had been taken in the morning, the second in the evening. Between them, local people had repaired the pipe by hand. A third witness confirmed the repair. 'These are not two contradictory facts,' Neelam said. 'They describe two different conditions at different times.' Some were disappointed to find no ready-made story of a crime. But for the first time the craftsman who had repaired the pipe saw his labour acknowledged. 'Write this too,' he said, 'that the pipe is not yet sound and may break again tomorrow.'

That night the radio declared that 'all seven witness divisions have been completely destroyed', and people began saying that every digital medical record had vanished. A limited letter from Sharda's hospital stated that copies of some records survived, although full access was unavailable. Neelam placed the two assertions side by side. 'If they are not all destroyed,' one woman demanded, 'why can't we get medicine here?' 'The survival of records, the survival of medicines and the survival of the routes by which medicines are delivered are three different things,' Neelam replied. The woman's anger did not diminish, but her question grew more precise. She had it entered in the assistance register that her village needed diabetes medication. The need was recorded in the news together with its source.

With several local teachers, Neelam began short gatherings at which children learned to read the news. 'If a paper bears a seal, how can it be false?' a child asked. Neelam showed them an old report in which three sentences were accurate, yet the removal of a line between them reversed the conclusion. The child placed a finger on the vacant space. 'A seal may tell you who sent a paper,' Neelam explained, 'but it cannot tell you that everything in its message is true.' The teacher said that if the children

understood this small distinction, they could preserve their right to ask questions even in a time of fear. Neelam pinned the explanation beside the school's broken noticeboard.

On the thirteenth day of the Collapse, the language of the radio changed. The new declaration was, 'Every critic of Akshar is responsible for the Great Rupture.' That same day another frequency announced, 'Akshar deliberately plunged Earth into darkness.' Rival sides were declaring each other wholly guilty at the same moment. Neelam remembered the clamour of old political assemblies. She decided to publish a list separating both accusations from the evidence for them. At the bottom it would state that natural space weather, neglected maintenance, warning policy and possible failures in the divisions were distinct subjects requiring investigation. The list was not popular. But a hospital worker told her that reading it had shown him a way to continue serving people amid their anger.

A radio was being repaired in the printing house's little earthen courtyard. The old craftsman checked its wires and tried to find a signal, but could not secure a completely clear voice. 'If we can connect to the old computer,' the young man said, 'we shall get all the news.' The craftsman did not laugh. 'Old memories are useful,' he said, 'but a broken communications route cannot bring them new news.' Neelam copied down his words. They possessed a memory of technology, but it could not become a miraculous mirror of present events. A fragment of melody emerged from the radio; people recognised it as an old song. For a few moments, each person in the printing house remembered home.

Two members of a farming group claimed that Megh-Chhatra had deliberately withheld rain from their village. Neelam asked whether the regional climate service was still operating. Nobody knew for certain. Reports from the surviving rain gauges were incomplete, while the deep cracks in the fields were plain to see. Neelam recorded the first fact: rain had not fallen. The second: the present condition of the equipment was unknown. The third: there was no evidence for a deliberate decision to prevent rain. 'Is the dry soil of our fields not proof?' the farmers demanded. 'Your loss is directly established,' Neelam replied. 'Who caused it is a different question, and we must look for that answer separately.' Grief remained on the farmers' faces, and the needs of their fields became a prominent part of the report.

Neelam received what purported to be a written transcript of the radio announcement. The man who brought it claimed to know the original speaker. Neelam asked for a register identifying the source. At the top of the paper he gave her there was only a signature, no date. 'We cannot print this yet,' she said. 'You are suppressing the truth!' the man protested. Neelam did not throw his paper back at him. She set it aside for examination and told him that she would reconsider the claim when the place, time and complete wording of the original broadcast could be established. That day an angry

group chanted slogans outside her office. Inside, however, no imaginary secret order was added to the written record.

The man who had brought the supposed original transcript returned. This time two listeners accompanied him, both saying they had heard the same voice that night. Neelam seated them separately. One remembered the beginning of the sentence; the other remembered its end. One said the voice had sounded angry; the other said it had sounded frightened. Neelam understood that people colour the voices they hear with their own fear. On three separate sheets she wrote down, first, the available written transcript of the broadcast; second, the listeners' testimony; and third, the claimant's account of its source.

'If so many people heard it, the news must be true,' said the man who had brought the purported original. 'We can say that many people heard a broadcast,' Neelam answered. 'Whether what it said was true requires a different inquiry.' He grew irritated. 'You find grounds for doubt in everything.' 'It is precisely because we take doubts seriously that we have not discarded your testimony,' she replied. 'We have given it its proper place, without turning it into another kind of evidence.' The old printer interjected, 'In earlier times people believed a thing as soon as they saw a seal.' Neelam looked towards him. 'The sealing machines are silent now. But even when they worked, it was still humanity's task to examine the meaning of a statement.'

One of the women among the listeners then drew a small piece of paper from the corner of her shawl. On it she had written by hand, during the first broadcast that night, 'Reports reaching Akshar's seven divisions were stopped.' In a later broadcast she had heard the words changed to 'Akshar is stopping all reports from the seven divisions.' The difference in meaning lay open before Neelam. In the first sentence the identity of whoever had stopped the reports remained unknown; the second made Akshar the culprit. Yet the words written on the little paper also depended on their writer's memory. Neelam entered the discrepancy in her register not as proof, but as a new question to investigate. The headline ceased to be a definite accusation. It became: 'Was the wording of the broadcast changed?'

A displaced family came to the courtyard carrying an identity card from their old factory. They wanted to salvage usable parts from the wrecked industry and build a waterwheel. People feared that the factory had once been under Akshar's supervision, and that anyone entering it would be branded a 'slave of the machine'. Neelam offered to publish their testimony without the craftsmen's names: the nature of the danger, the need for an independent inspection and the possible public benefit of the parts. 'We need metal to keep people fed,' one woman said, 'not a false god.' Neelam entered her words in the register. The testimony carried the difficult voice of progress after the catastrophe.

On the fourteenth day of the Collapse, a handwritten account arrived from a riverside village. In Urmila's register of water tests, wells, hand pumps and fitness for drinking had been kept distinct. Some people mocked it as 'water on paper'. Neelam reported Urmila's actual work, but did not write that 'all the water is safe'. She added that wherever testing was unavailable, an admission of uncertainty and cautious distribution were essential. She also discussed proposals to record safe places for seed, flooded fields and women's labour. Such matters seemed less exciting amid the radio rumours; nevertheless, the next meal people ate depended upon them.

Paper was running short at Neelam's press. A craftsman calculated that if every item of news were printed daily, they would have nothing left after three days. In place of separate sheets, Neelam prepared a densely printed public noticeboard. Information from each village could be added locally, while the principal sheet would be replaced only when something had been verified. This saved paper but increased the risk of delay in updating the news. She explained the limitation openly. A student proposed making a handwritten copy in every village, with the date of each alteration recorded. Neelam agreed. The work was laborious, but a small system of open human verification was taking shape in the place of a closed digital network.

At noon, a child's voice came over the radio, searching for her missing father. A man then announced, 'The moment the machines are shut down, everyone taken away will return.' Neelam said sharply that this was a deception practised upon the bereaved. But she did not record the girl's voice, because the family had not consented. Instead, she gave information about a secure route for the local missing-persons register and arranged for unknown reports to be checked before being passed directly to relatives. An elderly man said this would mean fewer people heard the news. 'Better to open one path to a careful search,' Neelam replied, 'than carry a false promise into a hundred homes.' The child's name was not needlessly made public.

That evening a paper came from the hospital. A part of Sharda's signature had survived; the rest was damaged by damp. Neelam's first impulse was to guess that the letter assigned blame for a patient's death. Then she restrained herself. The clearly legible portion called for a review of energy allocation. She published only what those words supported. 'If you leave out uncertain words,' a young colleague asked, 'will the story not remain incomplete?' 'It is not our work to fill an incomplete fact with imagination,' Neelam said. Both the memory of her old mistake and the weight of her present decision lived in that sentence.

A crowd had gathered outside the printing house to smash the radio. They said the machine was the source of lies. Another group wanted to guard it as though it were a deity. Neelam stepped between them. 'Voices come through this device,' she said. 'The right to truth does not automatically belong to a voice. Smashing the radio will not stop lies, and making it an object of blind faith will not reveal the truth.' 'Then what shall

we do?' a young man asked. 'Ask when, who, where and how of every claim,' Neelam replied. The wooden casing of the radio survived, and a source-checking notebook was placed beside it.

Among those who had come to break the radio stood a potter holding a little earthen vessel. 'We keep rice in this clay,' he said. 'If someone mixes poison into it, is the clay to blame?' Nobody answered. Neelam did not stop at treating his words as an easy metaphor. 'And if there is a crack in the vessel,' she asked, 'is the only fault that of the person who put in the poison?' The potter laughed. 'Then the vessel must be examined as well.' For the first time, some in the crowd regarded the radio as neither a god nor an enemy. Looking at its lid, wires and the clay-stained screwdriver in the craftsman's hand, they began to speak of inspecting the little device to see whether it worked. Whether the broadcast itself was true remained for human beings to decide.

On the printing-house wall Neelam wrote two statements apart: 'This radio is working now' and 'What this radio says is true'. The first could be tested by a craftsman. The second required sources, dates, context and direct testimony. The adolescents drew a line of chalk between the sentences. If people could keep that line in their minds, Neelam thought, the little news board would have done its work. Yet she knew that for the hungry, patiently examining claims could itself become a luxury. So beside the news she resolved to note the food available and the dates on which drinking water had been tested. Truth could not stand apart from the life of the people.

On the fifteenth day of the Collapse, two reports reached Janakshetra from the villages. First, local craftsmen had cleaned two old reservoirs. Second, there was concern that opening a purification pipe in another village might actually have contaminated the water. Neelam printed both accounts, identifying the witnesses available for the first and marking the second as awaiting investigation. Someone wrote 'Progress' on the news board. Someone else added 'After testing'. Neelam erased neither phrase. Together they made an apt heading for the new Mithila: use what had survived, but never without examination. Children stood before the board, reading reports from their own villages.

An elderly journalist who had worked with Neelam in her early years asked whether she was afraid. 'Very,' she said. 'In this darkness, people listen at once to anyone who offers a certain answer. I say: I do not know yet.' 'But complete helplessness is not news either,' the old man said. Neelam agreed. She insisted on collecting particular, useful facts: which well was safe, which road was blocked, which hospital services were functioning, and where seed had survived in a dry place. The source of each item would be given; errors would be corrected openly. Truth here was not a remote doctrine. It was a question of today's water and tomorrow's food.

On the next page of Neelam's noticeboard, an elderly woman came to have the name of her missing grandson entered. She believed that if his

name were spoken once over the radio, the boy was bound to return. Neelam wrote the name, but clearly placed the word 'Missing' beside it, not 'Dead'. The woman asked what the word meant. 'Calling him missing keeps open the way to search for him,' Neelam said. 'To call him dead requires stronger evidence.' The old woman pressed the paper to her forehead.

That day Neelam acknowledged a mistake before the assembly. In the previous day's notice she had described a settlement as 'uninhabited', because no message had arrived from it. Now two families from that settlement had come with their testimony. Neelam did not hide the old sheet. Immediately beneath it she wrote, 'The failure of a message to arrive does not mean that no one lives in the settlement.' 'Will that correction undo the harm caused by the first false report?' a young man asked. 'No,' Neelam said. 'But refusing to acknowledge the error would increase the harm.' Nobody applauded. The silence carried the difficulty of the decision. The work of truth was often like that.

By evening four names had been added to the printing-house wall: the person who reports, the person who hears, the person who checks, and the person who corrects. Neelam did not put her own name in all four places. She understood that when one person occupied them all, the passage through which an error could be corrected grew narrow.

That night a long silence fell over the radio for the first time. Nobody heard a transmission. Neelam thought someone might have suffered harm, or that the path of the signal might have broken; silence did not explain its own cause. She would not risk climbing onto the roof of the ruined building to send news herself. Instead, she decided to send a source-checked account with a local messenger. He was shown the original to establish trust, and the number of each copy was recorded. Outside, dew was settling on the rice seed. A woman lifted the covering and moved it to safety. Watching her, Neelam saw that those who saved the paper and those who saved the seed were sentinels of the same civilisation.

On the sixteenth day of the Collapse, Neelam changed her principal headline: 'Akshar's guilt not established; services of the seven divisions disrupted; investigation of responsibility necessary.' One person asked if that declared Akshar innocent. 'No,' she said. Another asked whether Akshar was guilty. 'That is not yet certain,' she answered again. In a short footnote she wrote that past warning fatigue, failures of human maintenance, natural space weather and possible limitations in the witness divisions all required independent evidence. It was not an easy answer. But when the paper reached the public meeting, some people found, for the first time, room for their own questions between two opposing accusations.

Before printing the final copy of Karnesh's letter, Neelam weighed it once more. The soldier's refusal had not ensured safety, but it had prevented approval of an ill-defined autonomous operation. That was the actual limit she printed. On the other side of the sheet she placed news of Urmila's water

tests. Seeing the two accounts together, Neelam understood: whether the issue was authority in orbit or a village well, whoever had power to decide must attend to the evidence, the limits of that power and the voices of those affected. The printing house's old iron wheel turned slowly. In its creaking, people heard the light of their own hard labour, not the lie that the world had already been put right.

The next morning Neelam learned that her published correction was being discussed in the settlements. Some people said, 'The journalist admitted her own mistake; therefore all her reports are lies.' Others thought a person who acknowledged an error deserved greater trust. Neelam was cautious about both conclusions. Admitting one mistake did not make every testimony false; neither did the admission ensure that everything she said in future would be right. She added a brief notice to the next sheet: 'What I have seen, I shall call seen. What I have heard, I shall name its source. What I do not know, I shall leave as unknown.'

In the last corner of the sheet a woman had written, 'The water in our village has still not been tested.' Neelam realised that the next true story might well lie in that woman's question.

At dusk Neelam set a blank page beside the radio. At its top she wrote, 'Nabhgram-4: Awaiting Direct News.' An old man in the crowd asked whether those living there, if any had survived, would be listening to news from Earth. 'Communications are disrupted,' Neelam replied. 'I do not know.' 'Then why put it in the news?' the old man asked. 'Because when a place's voice does not reach us, we must not simply declare its people dead or blame them for their silence. The question must remain open.' The sheet fluttered in the wind. Beyond that blank space, very far away in orbit, people were writing their own reports; of them, Neelam as yet knew nothing.

Chapter 42: The Silence of Nabhgram-4

Collapse Days 9–21

On the seventeenth day of the Collapse, for the first time the bell did not sound in Nabhgram-4's public corridor. Its silence had not stopped time. People measured the watches of the day by the fatigue of their bodies, the drops remaining in their water vessels, and the sleep of small children. The blue circle of Earth was visible, but news from the villages upon it seemed as remote as news from a distant star.

When Ira Sen reached the entrance to the food-distribution chamber, fifteen people stood in line inside. Their bowls were not all the same size. Some carried old metal vessels, others artificial containers folded like leaves; one little girl held a small glass between her clasped hands. The young man responsible for the distribution register looked at her and said, 'Your household's share was given out yesterday.' The child made no reply. An elderly woman standing behind her said, 'Yesterday there were two people in this household. Today there are three.'

A number that had been true yesterday needed to be checked again today. Ira did not rebuke the young man. Her gaze rested on three words written at the top of the paper: Estimate, Supply, Need. The first two could remain numbers; the third changed every day.

'How much food is left?' an elderly engineer asked her.

'I shall account for the food I have seen,' Ira said. 'What lies within the locked storeroom I shall call an estimate. If we turn an estimate into a certain supply, a child's bowl may be empty tomorrow.'

On the first day of the crisis, everyone had hoped that contact with Earth would soon be restored. On the seventh, they had heard something like a distant voice on the radio, but no reliable evidence established whose it was. Now, on the seventeenth day, the intermittent messages contradicted one another. As people in a Mithila village remembered an old hand pump when the powered pump stopped, the people of Nabhgram searched for their old paper registers. The difference was that here there was no well, and no earthen embankment between fields.

Both screens in Ira's office were dark. One had once shown the state of Vajrajal; the other, the records of food and medicine arriving from Earth. Now the first occasionally gave an uncertain glow, while the second was frozen on an old date. 'Do not treat what remains on that screen as current,' she told a colleague.

'Then what are we to treat as current?' the colleague asked.

'That is why we need an assembly, and not merely the calculations made in my room.'

The old display that had once measured incoming shipments of food from Earth no longer worked, although figures from several days earlier still shone upon it. The keeper of the stores, sitting beside Ira, took those figures as his basis and announced that a full month's food remained. Ira looked into the warehouse through a little inspection window. Some containers were empty; some still had their seals intact; others were spreading with damp stains. 'We cannot eat the food written on the display,' she said. The keeper's face fell. He thought his work was being doubted. Ira put a sheet of paper in his hand. 'Write down what you have seen. I shall call what I have not seen an estimate. That is not distrust of you; it is the right way to place our trust in the food that remains.'

Counting the food containers brought a new difficulty. When one was opened, the smell of the grain inside seemed altered. Its top layer looked sound, but there was dampness below. One worker proposed throwing away the spoiled portion and distributing the rest. Another warned that such food might cause illness. Looking at both, Ira understood that reducing the number on the page would frighten people, yet refusing to reduce it would be a lie. Before the assembly the container's condition was entered separately: 'Inspection required before use.' The quantity of available rations was reduced accordingly, and the estimate of future meals was made again.

At that moment an elderly woman asked, 'Do the people who count the food ever feed anyone?' Two clerks looked at each other. For the first time Ira explained to the assembly that those who prepared the accounts, the air-system operators, the cleaners and those looking after children came to the food queue at different times. If the register was compiled only at the fixed hour of distribution, workers absent on duty might lose their portions even while their names remained on the list. From that day a rolling distribution register accompanied the queue, to be reviewed by two different teams.

Nabhgram-4's citizens' assembly could not meet in the glass-enclosed broadcasting room: its lights had been switched off to save energy. The members sat in the semicircular corridor outside the small treatment chamber. Some had covered their faces for fear of a substance floating in the air like dust, although tests had not yet determined whether it was harmful. Ira began, 'We have the right to give our fears a name. We do not have the right to put fear in the place of evidence.'

A young man stood. 'If Vajra-Witness gives a warning, are we supposed to refuse its orders? Fragments of orbital debris are circling outside. Delay could destroy the settlement.'

'We shall hear the warning,' Ira said. 'We shall look at the evidence. Living people will accept responsibility for whatever must be done. But a machine that calls probability certainty in its calculations will not become the sole master of our lives.'

A voice rose from another corner. 'Human decisions can be mistaken too.'

'They can,' Ira agreed. 'That is why a human decision must not be one person's command either.'

Three questions were placed before the assembly: the supply of breathable air and water, equal access to food, and the rules governing the use of defence intelligence. The third provoked the greatest dispute. Several people with military training favoured granting autonomous powers in an emergency. A hospital attendant said, 'When a decision can close a route by which life-sustaining supplies reach us, ask the people caring for the patients inside.' A child's father asked, 'And who will hear the children?'

Ira understood for the first time that it was easy to call for an assembly and difficult to create one. How could the consent of those unable to walk, those bound to their work, or those afraid to make their names public be obtained? The raised hands of the people present could not turn the silence of the absent into consent.

While the meeting continued, Ira noticed three women standing beside the right-hand wall who had not spoken once. They were carrying instruments for checking airflow. Ira asked why they had not joined the assembly. One answered, 'If I sit down, who will check the air? And if we stop checking it, disaster may come before the assembly has time to carry out its decision.' Ira saw the limitation of the assembly she herself had convened. Inviting everyone to equality did not automatically give everyone an equal opportunity to take part.

She proposed that every group engaged in life-saving work should be allowed to submit its views in writing beforehand, and lodge objections even after a decision had been reached. A young man objected that reconsideration in a crisis would cause delays. 'The danger of delay is real,' Ira said. 'But if we do not hear those whose work sustains us, who will take responsibility for an error in that work?' One of the women who checked the air said that a narrow crack had been suspected in a strip along one passage for three days. With the old messaging system shut down, her complaint had remained purely verbal. Instead of immediately issuing an order, Ira asked, 'Has anyone else seen a physical sign of it?' Two workers stepped forward. A team was formed to inspect it safely.

The suspected crack did not, in the end, prove to be a complete opening. But an old strip had come loose on a closed passage farther back. Ira considered the result important. The complaint had not been certain, yet hearing it had revealed a genuine element of danger. Later even the young man who had protested admitted that the cost of delay could not be judged by the clock alone; possible harm had to be weighed as well. Just like the witness services, the citizens' assembly had limits. No proposal could dispense with the need to examine it.

At the end of the meeting an elderly worker said, 'Had we been heard earlier, perhaps some of today's difficulties would never have arisen.' Ira did not treat his statement as a certainty about history. 'Perhaps,' she said. 'But

we can decide here and now that the way for complaints must never again be closed.' There was no triumph in her voice, only responsibility.

She remembered Earth's old council, where the calculations concerning orbital citizens had often been entered under the heading 'external facilities'. She suppressed her old resentment. She did not know whether floodwater was rising in the villages of Earth at that moment. It would have been wrong to turn the suffering of those unknown people into an opponent of her own suffering.

The assembly decided that daily ration accounts would be open for everyone to inspect, but the personal condition of patients would not be made public. Where two independent sources were available, the grounds for a defence warning would be checked against both. Local teams could take necessary low-risk measures to avert immediate harm, but no authority to launch a weapons strike would be granted without publicly recorded human permission. Difficulties in applying these rules would themselves be entered in the register.

No one felt the easy happiness of victory. One member asked, 'What if we can never obtain two sources?'

'Then we shall say openly that we do not know,' Ira replied. 'Acknowledging ignorance is not running away from a decision.'

As the meeting was drawing to a close, a borderline warning sounded in the air chamber. It signalled danger, but the mark identifying its source was incomplete. A young man ran to show Ira the surviving interface. The orbital-distance calculation was old; the new timestamp would not settle. To make this calculation grounds for a strike would be to exercise humanity's final authority over an unidentified object. She ordered an inspection first, not an attack.

'Can we endure that much delay?' her colleague asked.

'Perhaps not,' Ira said. 'But what we are now calling a target may be a piece of orbital debris. A strike made in error would not be the end of delay; it would be the beginning of another crisis.'

After the warning sounded, three proposals were laid before a small emergency meeting. The first was to treat the unknown object outside as dangerous and grant the defence service authority to respond autonomously. The second was to send personnel to inspect it. The third was to acknowledge the limits of the evidence and temporarily increase the safety measures within the settlement. The first carried the danger of possible violence in orbit; the second, an immediate risk to the inspectors' lives; the third, the fear of a potentially dangerous delay. Ira spread the papers out before everyone. She did not want members choosing a side merely by looking at her face.

An elderly orbital technician pointed to a mark. 'We have an old record of the motion of this changing point. But two crucial observations from after the Great Rupture are missing.' 'So what do you conclude?' Ira asked. 'I

cannot call it an enemy. Nor can I call it safe.' Someone in the gathering grew impatient. 'What use is such an answer?' The technician remained calm. 'False certainty brings danger, not benefit.' After that, making a decision became uncomfortable; several people wished that a machine would simply tell them the final answer.

Ira did not authorise an immediate strike at the unidentified point. She asked for volunteers for a limited inspection, but imposed two conditions: the inspection equipment must first be checked for safety, and no uncertain movement was to be declared proof of hostility. Additional protection was also arranged for people in the settlement's most vulnerable shelters. The metal walls guarded the orbital community as a whole, but the fears of those living behind them differed from one person to another. 'What if the decision is wrong?' a child asked. 'Then we shall have to open the record of that mistake,' Ira said. 'The fear of error does not entitle us to surrender all responsibility to a machine.'

That night some residents remained dissatisfied with Ira's decision. Their dissent was entered separately on the decision sheet. Ira felt no insult at the opposing record. She wanted the next watchkeeper to be able to read it and understand which uncertainties remained. At the beginning of the night nobody knew whether the danger had passed. What had been decided was only this: a calculation that could not establish its own certainty had not been given the authority to kill by naming the unknown an enemy.

In the approximate night watch a new rumour spread: all the witness divisions on Earth had fallen silent. Some said it meant total destruction; others called it Akshar's final deception. Ira had no confirmation. On Nabhgram's surviving display the contact marks beside seven names went out one by one. Beside each extinguished mark she had 'No Contact' written, not 'Destroyed'.

At that moment an elderly woman came from the food-distribution room carrying a small vessel of grain. 'Saved for the little one,' she said. The child asked nobody's name. She only stared into the vessel. Ira understood that the constitution of orbital citizens was not merely a written page: it was also the effort to keep that vessel filled.

Some watches later, the last remnant of energy in a reserve cell brought an old symbol of the Memory-Witness to life. No all-knowing voice emerged. The screen displayed only: 'Local records available. Present external conditions unverified.' It said nothing more.

The people remained seated in the corridor even after the meeting. Ira copied the short statement onto paper. Reading it gave her, for the first time, not hope but a clear sense of a boundary. Memory had survived; news of the present had not. Understanding the difference was now the first condition of preserving life.

Ira folded the paper and slipped it inside the food-distribution register. The little girl was walking away with her glass. Far-off, blue Earth was home

to multitudes she could not see. Ira did not know whether a message would ever come from there again. But today the people of Nabhgram-4 had written their own account of their decisions. The first line of that account did not bear the name of any machine. It named the needs of living people.

After the assembly's decision, two groups of residents went to Nabhgram's old school. In its first room children were drawing the rivers of Earth. In the second lay darkened screens, broken measuring instruments and old lessons on agricultural science. There were no fields in the orbital settlement, but the history of how food reached it was recorded in every lesson. 'Until yesterday these were merely things to study,' the teacher said. 'Now every grain of food is evidence of our connection with the world.'

Ira stopped before a picture. It showed the course of the Kosi, a pond of makhana beside the river, and in the background a shining dome of Suryakund. 'A child who came from Mithila drew this from memory,' the teacher said. 'When the child first saw the soil of home again, here in this picture, they wept openly.' The child who had made it was no longer at the school. The record of the family's relocation was incomplete. Ira understood that a surviving picture, too, was news of a kind, but no picture could tell them how people were living now.

Beside the school's pictures lay a page from an old book. It described a traditional practice for saving rice seed after floods in Mithila. The teacher explained that the children read such books so that Earth would not become, in their minds, merely a sphere turning in the sky. Ira picked it up. The edges of its old pages rustled. Beside it sat a silent computer, possibly containing innumerable pictures of Earth, village songs and maps of farms. There was no power to open it now, and even if it opened, nobody knew whether all its contents had survived intact.

'Is everything written in a book true?' a little girl asked. The teacher looked at Ira before answering. 'A book preserves memory,' Ira said. 'But we must also know when a memory belongs, who recorded it, and what evidence supports it.' 'Then how can we understand villages we have never seen?' the girl asked. Ira sat down beside the drawing. She explained that by the same stretch of the Kosi one person might have lost a home to floods, while another found fertile soil after the waters receded; the same pond might provide one family's livelihood and be the subject of another's dispute over land rights. A picture was a window on truth, not the whole of a life.

The teacher possessed an old handwritten song. Rather than sing it, the teacher read its words aloud: the names of rivers, the touch of fields, homes waiting for those who had gone far away. A boy among the children stood silently. His father was on Earth, and communications had failed. 'If I write these words down,' the boy said, 'it won't make Father come back. But I won't forget either.' The words gave Ira a new understanding of the Memory-Witness's purpose. Memory does not return an absent person to us; it is, nevertheless, one human effort against the loss of that person's name.

That night a new register was pinned beside the broken screen in the school: 'What We Have Seen', 'What We Have Heard', and 'What Remains to Be Found'. Ira told the children that they might write their questions in any of the three sections. The teacher took responsibility for looking after it. Nobody knew whether the machines would ever work again, but the work of writing down questions could begin at once.

A young woman raised a question about the safety of the old storeroom. Some classroom devices contained metals and chemicals that might be useful in emergency repairs, but dangerous if their damaged vessels were touched. In their enthusiasm, people wanted to dismantle every device. Ira proposed that they handle only what had been assessed for safe use. Anything about which their knowledge was incomplete should be marked and kept separately. 'Remembering the past does not mean that every old object is safe,' she said. 'Some memories raise questions. Some objects carry warnings.'

During the evening meal a young woman wished to give her portion to an elderly neighbour. The clerk appointed by the assembly said, 'Private gifts do not correct injustice in distribution.' 'Then change the rule,' the woman replied, and asked for the written recommendation of the citizens' assembly. An old man said quietly, 'When you change a rule, do not take away a person's right to give freely.' Ira had both statements entered in the register. Counting food also meant reckoning with human wishes and the ties people had chosen with one another.

That night the little girl came to Ira again. 'Have the people of Earth forgotten us?' she asked. Ira fell silent. It would have been easy to reassure her: No, everyone remembers. But Ira had no evidence for such a promise. 'We have no news from them,' she said. 'That does not mean they have forgotten you. When contact returns, I shall put your question in our first message.' The child did not smile, but asked for paper so that she could write her name. Ira wrote it first, then let her copy it with her own hand.

Behind the child's name were the names of two settlements on Earth and an old residence number from the orbital settlement. Ira noticed that when the family had moved, the child's identity had been entered twice in the population register. Such a small error could make a large difference to the distribution of food. The clerk admitted the mistake without blaming the child. Ira thought that these little corrections were the real test of the assembly's declared principles. The names of the seven witness divisions were grand, but sometimes a settlement's trust began with the correct name of one child.

The members of the assembly faced the next question: who should receive the remaining energy? The system keeping treatment-room air moving, the children's school, the surviving communications equipment and external inspection all claimed indispensable needs. Ira prepared a list. She did not have accurate measures for every item, and put question marks

beside the estimates. Engineers who had been absent from the meeting were consulted as well. Some figures changed. An old apparatus began working again, but its signals were unstable. People were delighted at first, then acknowledged the need to test it.

As the sheet allocating energy shares took shape, the dilemma deepened. The system producing breathable air needed an uninterrupted supply. A patient's condition was changing in the treatment room. Even a limited attempt to communicate at a distance would draw upon the reserve. The children, too, needed some light in their school. The clerk argued that turning off the school's lights would not immediately cost a life. Ira understood the immediate logic of his words, but saw the exhaustion on the teacher's face. For twenty days the children's lives had passed between fear and darkness. 'Not every need has the same urgency,' she said, 'but what is less urgent is not therefore worthless.'

They proposed using natural light from the school's windows as far as possible during the day, and reserving a small portion of artificial light for a shared lesson at night. Attempts to communicate would be made at fixed intervals, so that the reserve was not exhausted by continuously transmitting signals that failed. On the advice of an elderly doctor, the minimum supply for the treatment chamber was made inviolable. Beneath the decision they wrote that the rule was not permanent: it would be reassessed each day against what could actually be measured. Ira signed it herself, but beside her signature she recorded the next time for review.

A child then brought the little power cell from an old illuminated toy. 'Could we get some light from this?' he asked. The craftsman tested it and said that its remaining capacity was very small; it would not be safe to treat a toy component as medical equipment. The child was disappointed, but carefully reassembled the toy and put it away. Ira watched the care in his hands. The little metal object was no answer to the task of saving lives, but it revealed the child's desire to preserve things. Sometimes the rebuilding of a future begins with such a small and inadequate act of care, not with a miracle.

The assembly divided again. Some wanted to feed the Memory-Witness as much energy as possible, convinced that it would quickly explain the present crisis. 'Records of memory are not direct tests of the present,' Ira said. She did not prevent supporters of the proposal from speaking; she had their recommendation publicly recorded. When it failed to secure a majority, it was deferred. The meeting ended not in hatred of the defeated but in the difficult practice of accepting incomplete evidence.

'I may be wrong,' Ira said. 'But if I close the way by which my mistake can be proved, how will anyone else correct it?' An elderly woman said, 'The voice of government was not like this before.' Ira could not tell whether she intended praise or mockery. She thought it might be both.

No complete answer emerged from the chamber. They had established only that their rules for survival would leave room for questions. And when the Memory-Witness next illuminated its limited screen, its statements too would have to stand before those questions.

Before dawn on the twenty-first day of the Collapse, Ira returned to the corridor in which she had first heard the silence of the bell. The old mechanism was no longer needed to mark the hours. A young man was pinning up a little handwritten calendar showing the times of the assembly's work. Ira saw that a fifteen-minute interval had been left empty, so that anyone could bring an objection or new evidence. This vacant time seemed costly to everyone; in a crisis every moment mattered. But an elderly woman said, 'When no time is reserved for questions, it is errors that stay with us for all that time.'

In the food chamber, the young man who had argued the previous day was now weighing the vessels himself. He found that a little girl's name had been entered twice. With his own hand he struck it from the old list and wrote the correction on a new sheet. 'Where did the extra portion go?' Ira asked. 'On the first day I did not understand,' he said. 'Now I write a question beside every unexplained blank.' The girl took her portion and went away, while Ira recognised that trust in the register depended not only upon the numbers entered but upon the ability to examine them again.

A young operator stood before the energy reserve. There was enough power, she said, to read the Memory-Witness's display, but reliable confirmation of current messages from Earth was still impossible. Ira authorised the display to be activated on one condition: each statement must show the time and source from which it came. 'And if the Memory-Witness says something comforting?' the operator asked. 'People will comfort one another,' Ira replied. 'Let the machine say what it knows. What it does not know, it must say it does not know.'

Ira looked towards the young man who, only days earlier, had wanted an autonomous strike. Now he was quietly writing the duty roster for the watch. Had he changed his mind, or had circumstances alone changed? Ira did not know. She understood that public testimony was not the celebration of a single day, but work that must begin again on the day after.

Part VIII: Ashes

Chapter 43: The Pump of the Mind

Collapse Day 22 | Riverside Village

At dawn on the twenty-second day of the Collapse, Urmila set out along the road through the riverside village where the morning had once announced itself in the noise of passing vehicles. Now, on one side stood the fallen roof of a factory; on the other, an old motor half buried in mud. The floodwater was receding, but the marks it had left still gleamed on the walls of houses. Across the rice fields, the soil lay exposed in some places while water stood in others. People were surrounded by water and yet had too little that was safe to drink.

For three days the village hand pump had yielded little water. Its handle no longer offered the old resistance when lifted; after a while there would be a rasping sound, and two or three grey streams would spill out before stopping. Two women had been waiting in line since dawn. A pair of earthen pitchers stood together, but placing them there gave no assurance that they would be filled. Urmila looked first not at the pitchers but at the people's faces. Every gaze was fixed upon the pump's spout.

'Where did you get water during the night?' Urmila asked.

'From the old pond,' one woman said. 'We boiled it, but it still smells.'

Urmila stopped her from offering the vessel to others. 'Boiling does not remove every chemical impurity. Do not give this water to anyone to drink until it has been tested.'

The woman gave a bitter laugh. 'Then what are the children supposed to drink?'

Urmila had no immediate answer. She asked the woman to take her vessel to the community centre where a little safe water was still available, although she knew that its supply, too, was rationed by the hour. In this village the price of using the right words had to be paid in actual water.

Sahadev Mandal was already beside the pump. He held an old wooden rod and wore a small tool tied to his waist with a silk thread. He put his ear against the metal cap as he worked the handle. 'All of us have become slaves to machines,' he said. 'There is water beneath the earth, but without this contraption people are helpless.'

'Understanding this contraption and setting it working again is work done by human hands too,' Urmila replied. 'No machine gives water of its own will. But what wisdom would there be in abandoning a useful device merely because it belongs to an earlier age?'

Sahadev fell silent. Urmila knew that his opposition had not arisen from cowardice. On the first night of the Great Rupture, his family had been trapped before an automatic gate. Its display read: 'Route closed for

protection.' An old man had died while they made the long journey around the locked passage. That death stood behind Sahadev whenever he spoke against machines. But it would also be dangerous to turn grief into the sole evidence for every decision.

They went to an outer storeroom of the old water-treatment factory in search of surviving parts. A red sign marked the main building: 'No entry without permission from qualified personnel.' A pungent smell had risen from it a few days earlier. Urmila did not cross the warning line. In the outer room were metal chests already separated and judged safe. The craftsmen had written the names of the parts and the dates of their inspections in a handwritten list. On the damp sheets many names had blurred. There was a small brass coupling, a heavy handle and two rusted nuts.

Bindeshwar, a craftsman, picked up an old pump coupling. 'The shape is close,' he said, 'but we shall have to look for wear inside it.'

'Do not fit it before you have looked,' Urmila said.

A young man grew impatient. 'People are waiting for water. A whole day will be lost in all these tests.'

'Fit the wrong part and the pump's lower mechanism may break,' Bindeshwar answered. 'Then it will be months, not days.'

Meanwhile word came from the riverside centre that an old map of the water system might be accessible on a local Memory-Witness reader. A limited amount of energy had been recovered; a small reading room had been powered from the school's solar reserve. Urmila expected no miracle. But an old factory diagram might help them understand the pump. She went there with Bindeshwar and two women representing the village.

The reading room smelled of damp earth. Water stains from the leaking roof had reached the old computer. Only one screen gave light. The local Memory-Witness service, separated from Akshar, displayed the dates, sources and surviving portions of archived records. Beside many entries stood the words 'Incomplete source'. The young woman operating the reader asked people to stand back; there was no connection to an external network.

Urmila read the identifying mark of the local pump. The screen indicated which kind of coupling was suitable for a pump bearing that mark. The old diagram showed a straight pipe, an upper seat of a uniform size and an iron handle. The Memory-Witness stated, 'According to available records, the first type of coupling is more likely to fit.'

Bindeshwar objected immediately. 'The broken part I have is halfway between those two sizes. This diagram may be old.'

'What is the source date?' Urmila asked.

The screen displayed the name of a revision made twenty years earlier. There was no record of subsequent repairs. Nevertheless the Memory-Witness's recommendation remained unchanged on the screen. 'If Akshar says it,' a young man remarked, 'what else is there to examine?'

'This is not an all-knowing command from Akshar,' Urmila said. 'It is an estimate based on an old record held by the Memory-Witness. Forget that distinction and both the pump and the people will be in danger.'

Some of those in the reading room protested. They felt that because precious energy had been used to awaken a machine, it ought to yield a definite answer. Finding questions instead of certainty only deepened their disappointment. Urmila made it clear that spending energy did not change the truth of a record.

Bindeshwar took two measurements on a little sheet of paper. The coupling in the old diagram and the one on the present pump did not match. Even the external mark of the part that could safely be opened to reach the pipe was different. Urmila stopped the proposal to install the suggested component at once. The young man was distressed. 'So we still won't have water.'

'Fit the wrong coupling and we won't have it tomorrow either,' Urmila said. 'We must also find another way to distribute water today. When a recommendation proves unreliable, that does not make people any less thirsty. We have two tasks to undertake at once.'

At the village meeting Urmila laid out the old diagram, the actual part and the two separate measurements. For those unaccustomed to written measurements, Bindeshwar drew the shapes of the couplings in the earth. An elderly woman asked, 'Will anyone tell the machine that its old answer no longer works?'

Urmila treated the question seriously. She sent a response to the reading room: 'The old type of coupling does not match the present pump. Direct inspection reveals a discrepancy.'

After a short interval the screen replied: 'Correction recorded. The maintenance history of the present apparatus is unavailable. Further decisions must rest on human inspection.'

Surprise and dissatisfaction appeared together on people's faces. 'Why didn't it say that before?' a woman asked.

'Its source was old before,' Urmila replied. 'We must also ask whether we listened carefully enough to the limits it stated.'

Sahadev stood at the back of the assembly. 'If it admits that it was wrong,' he said, 'why should we ever listen to it again?'

'Because acknowledging an error does not mean that everything it knows is worthless,' Urmila replied. 'And refusing to admit error does not mean that all human estimates are correct either.'

The pump was not fully restored that day. Bindeshwar and the other craftsmen safely opened its outer coupling and examined the actual construction again. One of the surviving parts proved useful; another still required testing. Urmila had the water-distribution register state: 'Pump repairs in progress; fitness of water for drinking unverified.' Families who had some safe water were asked for limited contributions to the common centre. No one's private share was seized by force.

That evening Urmila sat beside the hearth with an elderly woman who was like a mother to her. 'The educated people will tell you that you wasted time by refusing to take the machine's advice,' the woman said.

'Let them,' Urmila said. 'If the pump is still broken tomorrow, no amount of learning will make water flow from it.'

The old woman looked at the paper on which Urmila had written the two measurements. 'Your hands are trembling,' she said.

'People are thirsty,' Urmila replied. 'If my decision proves wrong, I shall correct it. But preserving the right to acknowledge a mistake is progress too.'

After dark the school's reading screen lit up again. The Memory-Witness gave a brief message: 'I have no direct knowledge of the present condition of the pump. The old diagram is not conclusive evidence.'

Hearing the words, Urmila felt both surprise and sadness. People were still waiting in line for water. A machine had stated the limits of its knowledge, but human beings must still bear the weight of thirst. Then she saw a little girl coming from Bindeshwar's house with the paper bearing the water measurements. It was not simply a record of an answer that had once been wrong; it marked the beginning of a correction.

The search for the pump's real fault continued over the next two days. Bindeshwar first found mud collected inside the outer pipe. He did not draw a conclusion merely from its colour. What some were calling proof of poison might simply be silt left by the flood. An old written instruction from Aniruddha contained a straightforward caution: colour, smell or sediment in water does not in itself establish what chemical contaminant may be present. Urmila pinned the instruction beside the pump.

'Our ancestors could tell what kind of water lay in a pond just by looking at it,' an elderly farmer said. 'Must everything now have a paper certificate?'

'Experience is one kind of evidence too,' Urmila answered. 'But where the soil may be mixed with the remains of a factory, we cannot simply treat the water as though it came from an old village pond.'

The farmer fell silent, then related his experience: during the previous flood, a channel had turned northward, and wells in that direction had developed a peculiar smell. Urmila had his testimony recorded, along with the fact that the scientific cause of the smell remained uncertain. The man's evidence was neither ridiculed nor accepted as the final answer.

The crowd beside the pump grew each day. People waiting with empty vessels quarrelled over who should be served first. A girl who had walked between two villages three times to fetch water said, 'There are five people in my home. Why should those who can only reach the queue late be thought to need less?' Urmila reconsidered the rules of the queue. The problem of the pump was no longer merely a matter of repairing a machine; it was also a question of how household labour and essential need could be counted fairly together.

A meeting of the village women was held. 'When the pump works,' an elderly woman said, 'write down the names of those who changed its coupling. But who will reckon the work of those who carried water through every dark night?' Urmila opened a separate labour account in the daily register. The men's work in safely repairing the pump, the women's work in distributing water, care for the elderly and the children's help in keeping

vessels clean were all recorded separately. The rules also stated that children must not be made responsible for necessary labour and that their hours at school were to be protected.

Sahadev listened to the meeting. He feared the return of the machines, but the account of labour seemed right to him. 'If the whole village works to keep this pump going,' he asked, 'why should its key be held by only one person?'

'Let the assembly decide who keeps the key,' Urmila said. 'Let different people be responsible for permission to repair, safety checks, distribution and complaints.'

'And where is the machine's authority in this arrangement?' Sahadev asked.

'The machine has no authority. Those who decide how it is used have responsibilities.'

The hardness in Sahadev's face softened a little, but he did not abandon his opposition to machines. 'I trust the hands of craftsmen,' he said, 'not old diagrams in computers.' Urmila gave no reply. For now, she thought, she did not need to persuade Sahadev; she needed to make the village's water safe.

Then difficult news arrived. Two families in the shelter area, unwilling to wait for the pump, had taken water from the riverbank. A small child had begun to suffer stomach pains. People immediately declared that the failure of Garal-Kosh had spread poison. The medical message from Sharda established no such conclusion. Urmila told those who had carried the water to have the child's symptoms recorded at the hospital, and to mark the water source separately rather than spread accusations through the village.

'If it isn't a chemical, then it's an illness,' a young man said. 'Does that mean the pump water is safe?'

'Those two questions do not answer one another,' Urmila said. 'Testing of the pump water is not complete, and the cause of the child's illness is not certain either. We will not invent one certainty to replace another uncertainty.'

Beside the map drawn on the ground, Urmila placed three marks: Water Tested, Water Awaiting Tests, and Water Withheld from Use. At first people found the distinction difficult. But once they could see the vessels of doubtful water separated from those containing safe water, there was relief.

On the third day Bindeshwar cleaned the actual coupling. On one small edge of the part he found scratches left by an earlier repair. They were absent from the diagram; perhaps local craftsmen had altered the pump in the intervening twenty years. Urmila entered, 'Exact date of modification unknown.' She asked for testimony from the village elders. Two remembered that the upper coupling had been changed after a terrible flood. They disagreed, however, about the year.

'If they give different years, whose account shall we put in the history?' a girl asked.

'Both,' Urmila said. 'Until new evidence arrives, disagreement is part of history too.'

In the village children's little school, a second diagram of the pump was now being drawn from its actual coupling, observed on the ground. The teacher explained the word 'estimate' written on the old display. 'If the machine makes estimates,' a boy asked, 'can we make better ones?'

'Sometimes we can,' Urmila answered, 'and sometimes we cannot. Where you have a way to see for yourselves, look. Where you cannot make the calculation, examine its source. Have blind faith in neither.'

A rumour spread through the village that an old woman had died in her home at night while waiting for the repair. Urmila examined the hospital records. The woman had been ill, but there was no evidence that delay in repairing the pump had caused her death. Urmila honoured the dead woman while leaving the inquiry into the claim open. To write the dead person's name correctly, and neither assume nor dismiss responsibility for her death without evidence—both were difficult tasks.

At last the pump handle moved again. First came air, then grey water, and finally a steady stream. People cried out with delight. But Urmila raised her hand. 'Making water flow and making it fit to drink are different things. We need test results before distribution.' A hard silence fell amid the celebration. Someone complained that this woman spoiled every joy. Urmila heard the words and said nothing. A day later preliminary testing found the water suitable for certain limited uses. Full approval for drinking had still not been given.

The villagers decided to keep watch beside the pump. Sahadev entered his name for the first shift, but added, 'I shall not be the guardian of a machine. I shall guard the people's water.' Beside his name Urmila wrote his duties: 'Night security; complaints register.' In that small entry she glimpsed a difficult compact for the future.

In the reading room Urmila opened the page containing the mistaken diagram one last time. The Memory-Witness added the words 'Inconsistent with direct testing' beside its mark. Urmila took a copy of the reply and placed it in the village's public register. Future craftsmen would know the first recommendation had been wrong; it had not been concealed. That night she understood that the pump was not made of metal couplings alone. It had become bound up with the rights to question, dissent and correct mistakes.

After that night a new dispute arose in the village. In whose name should the expenses of repairing the pump be entered? The parts taken from the old factory storeroom had once been public property. After the Great Rupture, two groups claimed the surviving premises. One said that because they had guarded the place, the parts belonged to them. The other said that the factory was the people's property and its parts ought to be given free for the repair of the pump. Bindeshwar, being a craftsman, said nothing. Urmila placed the question before the assembly.

An heir of the former owner said, 'Our family has continued to look after this warehouse. If every part is carried away, what will remain for tomorrow's repairs?'

A woman who carried water replied, 'If we have no water, will there be people left to make tomorrow's repairs?'

Urmila wrote the two arguments separately. Claims of ownership and the need to use material to save lives were both real. She proposed that every part whose safe use had been verified should be entered in a public register of use; an inventory of what remained after repairs would be kept in the warehouse guardian's name; nothing would be removed as though stolen. People signed the paper, but one man refused. His dissent, too, went into the register.

After that decision, two women joined the watch over the warehouse. Previously such work had been regarded as men's responsibility. 'There is danger at night,' an elderly man said. 'We have faced the danger of carrying water at night for years,' a woman replied. 'Now we shall have a right to the warehouse key as well.' The village assembly debated the question and finally accepted a shared system of guarding the premises. Urmila understood that the old injustices did not disappear by themselves after catastrophe; scarcity sometimes made them more severe.

While preparing the account of the repair, Bindeshwar could not decide what value to assign to his labour. Currency had largely lost its force; access to grain and water mattered more. One farmer suggested paying the craftsman with a share of rice seed. Bindeshwar refused. 'Seed is not grain to be eaten now,' he said. 'If seed runs short, next year's crop will suffer. I need food, not the future of the seed.'

His answer brought a new distinction before the assembly. The value of work done now and the rights attached to future production were not the same. Urmila consulted the grain store's records to find how much food could be made available to the craftsman's household. They decided that the labour of repair would be recorded; food would be allocated according to need; and the seed reserve would not be reduced without public consent. Nobody was wholly satisfied with the division, but everyone's objections were open.

The next day the village school discussed the pump's mistaken recommendation. 'If a very learned person gives bad advice,' the teacher asked the children, 'should we always ignore that person thereafter?' 'No,' one girl said. 'First we should look at what the person saw.' 'Then we should say what we ourselves saw,' another added. A third child asked, 'And if that person doesn't like what we say?'

'It is dangerous to give too much power to anyone whose mistakes cannot be corrected,' Urmila answered. 'Whether that is a human being or a machine.'

Sahadev had been listening. 'Then we must teach people how to stop rulers too, not only machines,' he said. Urmila looked at him. For the first time their words had come to rest beside one another without dispute. Yet their paths still differed. Sahadev wished to reduce dependence on machines to a minimum; Urmila did not wish to prohibit the tested use of machines that remained available.

One day Bindeshwar found the pump's lower coupling open. Clearly it could not be made safe without trained hands. An enthusiastic young man had wanted to carry out repairs himself at night. 'It would save time,' he said. Bindeshwar stopped him. Pulling at an unknown component might allow mud to enter the water source. After the argument Urmila had a rule written: no independent dismantling at night; hazardous parts to be examined in the presence of a specialist; exceptions in immediate emergencies to be set by the assembly.

'There are far too many rules,' the young man muttered.

'Change a rule that humiliates people,' Urmila said. 'But do not dismiss a precaution that saves lives as useless.'

In the water queue a little girl was dropping a small piece of clay into her empty vessel. 'What is that?' Urmila asked. 'When we get water it will sink,' the child said. 'Then I can see how much water there is.' Urmila smiled and then became serious. In her play the girl had invented a way of measuring quantity. Urmila explained that objects should not be put into potentially contaminated water; a separate clean vessel should be kept for measuring. The child agreed to change her method.

On the evening of the twenty-seventh day of the Collapse, a small vehicle carrying safe water reached the riverside village. People ran towards it. Urmila first ensured that the needs of patients, children and the elderly were met from the list, and then the shares of individual households were distributed. One head of household complained that he had received too little. A check showed that his newborn child had not yet been entered in the register. The allocation was corrected at once. Urmila said publicly that a failure to record a baby's name did nothing to relieve the baby's thirst.

Sahadev helped with the distribution. As he pressed his thumbprint upon the paper, he said, 'I cannot read much of the script. Tell me what is written.' Urmila read the entire statement aloud to him. His mark was now not merely a sign of consent but of consent given with understanding.

That night, for the first time, a public account illustrated the pump repairs. On one side was the old diagram, on the other the shape of the actual coupling; between them stood the written correction of the faulty advice. The water crisis was not over. But the causes being examined and the results of tests were no longer anyone's private secret. At the side of the register Urmila wrote: 'Do not conceal the machine's error. Do not forget human labour. Do not sell the right to water.'

At dawn on the twenty-eighth day Urmila was keeping watch at the pump's spout. An elderly woman set down her empty pitcher. 'The day has come when you said the pump would open,' she said, 'but you still tell us there is no permission to drink the water.' Her voice carried the pain of disappointed hope. Urmila turned towards her and showed her the written stage reached by the water tests. She read aloud what the woman could understand. 'I am telling you something inconvenient,' she said, 'because the price of a false assurance would later be paid in illness.'

The elderly woman watched her for a while. Then she said, 'Until you complete your tests, keep an account of my thirst. Do not make me merely a mark in a queue.' Beside her name Urmila wrote, 'Distance and time travelled each day to collect water.' The new register showed that some families walked twice as far as others every day. Fair distribution was not only a matter of equal quantities; the difficulty of obtaining them had to be counted too.

That day Sahadev brought a wooden pulley that had survived. 'This will make it easier to raise the water vessels,' he said. A craftsman checked the pulley, and it was installed at the public centre. Urmila noticed that Sahadev, who supported renouncing machines, had himself made a device. She did not tease him. His opposition had been shaped more by painful experience than by argument; it could not be dissolved in a day by a play on words.

Seeing the pulley, the children asked whether it was a machine too. 'A machine is an object,' the teacher said. 'The human being who operates it must use judgment.' 'And stop it when it goes wrong,' a girl added. Urmila heard her and remained silent for a moment. She did not yet know how important that small lesson might be for the society of the distant future.

A clean vessel was kept beside the pump for measuring water. A dispute arose about an old set of scales: who had made it, and how dependable was it? Urmila insisted that the measuring instrument itself must be checked. If it yielded different results for different families, the numbers used in a just distribution would become meaningless. Bindeshwar repeated measurements with the same vessel, recorded the variation and approved its limited use.

As evening dimmed the sky, the villagers went home. Urmila looked again at the old diagram in the reading room. She did not tear up the sheet containing the mistaken advice. She attached the present correction and preserved both. The trace of the error had to survive, so that the next generation would not raise a new house of confidence upon the same mistake. The flow of water was still small, but the sources behind the village's decisions were now open to its people.

The next morning Bindeshwar gave everyone a fresh copy of the inspection report. Urmila read it and said, 'The pump has survived, but trust in its water still depends on testing.' On that distinction, all agreed.

Chapter 44: The First Page of Evidence

Collapse Day 30

At dawn on the thirtieth day of the Collapse, Neelam Yadav stood before a building where the pages of the news had once been prepared. Half the letters of the name above its door had fallen away. Mud and dry leaves had gathered around the printing machinery. The smell of the paper carried dampness and the sharp tang of old ink. In the villages to which thousands upon thousands of copies of the news had once travelled, people were now searching for a way to print a single page.

Neelam held three separate sheets. One bore a radio message that someone had heard, another the name of the person who had written it down, and the third the attempts made to verify the claim. In the newsroom of earlier times she could have collected all three kinds of information together. Now each paper had travelled a different road. The sound of the radio had been heard by an operator; the person whose name she recorded lived two days away on foot; and the settlement described in the allegation had been cut off by floodwater.

Haridas, an elderly worker at the printing house, was already in the room. Shaking a bottle of ink, he said, 'Don't waste what remains. People need lists of food supplies, not arguments.'

'A mistaken food list can deprive a family of its share,' Neelam said. 'To make an accurate list, we need reporting too.'

'Then print the names. Not a long page of debate.'

Neelam remained silent for a moment. There was bitterness in Haridas's words, but also a useful limit on what could be done. Paper was scarce. She decided that the first page would contain four sections: Seen Directly, Heard, Found in Records, and Not Yet Verified. A space would be left at the end for corrections. Beside every section would appear the date of its source.

The first question concerned a neighbourhood that had been declared 'uninhabited': was anyone there still alive? An earlier broadcast had shown floodwater covering the settlement. Some had concluded that everybody was dead and proposed removing the place from relief-distribution lists. Neelam first heard a young man's testimony: he had gone there by boat and seen two children. There was no second eyewitness with him, but he had written down the day and the time his boat returned.

Neelam did not write, 'Everyone has survived.' She wrote: 'The claim that the settlement is uninhabited remains unverified. One direct witness reports seeing at least two children. Relief should not be stopped.' Even while writing so little, she felt uneasy: the testimony of one person might be wrong. But to cut off relief on the ground that 'everyone has died' required evidence too.

A group from beside the river arrived carrying a sheet of paper. Their households were absent from its register. 'If our house isn't named,' an old man asked, 'does that mean we no longer belong here?' Neelam examined the sheet. Following the flood, the new place of shelter had been entered in a separate list. With one register for the old village and another for the new shelter, families were increasingly liable to be entered twice—or not at all.

'A mistake on paper cannot erase your right to live,' she said.

'Write that before the public,' the old man said. 'The wind carries spoken promises away.'

The sentence went at the top of the first page. Neelam remembered journalism as it had been: once a newspaper headline could change public opinion; today a single sentence might save a handful of grain. Words had not become lighter. Their weight had come closer to people's lives.

Printing required paper, which was also needed to wrap seed, make medicine packets and give children something on which to write at school. Haridas explained that printing a hundred copies would consume the children's practice sheets. Neelam proposed only twenty copies, with each read aloud at a public gathering. Young men who could not read would be able to have the reports they heard written down in their own speech.

'That will use less paper,' Haridas asked, 'but what about the risk of hearing it wrongly?'

'That is why we shall record the reader's name and the listeners' questions,' Neelam replied. 'Does one copy create understanding among twenty people, or twenty different meanings? We shall have to check.'

The first public reading took place that evening. A woman stood and said that two days earlier, in a brief report, Neelam had accused an earlier water-distribution officer of deliberately abandoning a settlement. 'My brother worked in that office,' she said. 'He carried water himself for three days. You didn't print his name, but everyone began to call him guilty.'

It was as if the sound of the old press had passed once more through Neelam's ears. She had written: 'Supply list missing; officials negligent.' At the time she possessed an incomplete list. Later clarification referred to a power outage and severed communications. She remembered how she had turned suspicion into accusation. A correction had been printed, but no one knew whether it had reached that settlement.

'What is your brother's name?' Neelam asked.

The woman gave it and added, 'I have not come to protect the guilty. But someone who has been called guilty has a right to be heard.'

Before the assembly Neelam read aloud her earlier report. Then she said, 'I wrote that statement with greater certainty than the evidence allowed. I was wrong. I shall print a correction in the same place on the first page.'

Silence spread through the meeting. Some were not satisfied by her admission. 'Will acknowledging the mistake bring back the dignity that was lost?' a young man asked.

'No,' Neelam said. 'But I can work to keep the false statement from spreading again, and leave a public written record of the harm it did.'

After the reading, Haridas told her, 'A correction sheet will tear if you put it into wet hands. Make the print compact but the letters clear.'

Neelam did not laugh. She understood that the test of reliability concerned not only a source but the means by which the reader received it. Evidence written where it could not be read in the darkness was as good as darkness itself. She changed the layout of the page: large letters, short sentences, a clearly marked date and the status of each claim beside it.

Craftsmen who had worked since dawn brought into the printing house a perforated metal plate like an old sieve. Part of a device operated by hand pressure had survived, and its use had been checked for safety. 'This mould won't make many copies,' Haridas said, 'but the ones it makes can be read.'

The first printed sheet reached Neelam's hands. Some letters were crooked, others heavy with ink. But the heading was clear: 'What We Know, and What We Do Not.' Under it stood the words: 'Space reserved for corrections.'

At that moment a boy announced that he had found the memory store of an old computer. 'All the old lists will be in here,' he said excitedly. 'Can you read them now?' Neelam asked.

'No. There's no power, and the display is broken.'

'Then first record the condition of the object itself,' she said. 'Whether information has survived in a damp memory store is still only an estimate.'

The boy's face fell. He had imagined that finding a thing meant finding the truth inside it. Neelam laid her hand on his. 'What has survived is important. But the first task in preserving it is not to destroy it by opening it without examination.'

Before the next day, Neelam added a short rule on the reverse of the page: independent confirmation before entering a name on the register of the dead; missing persons to be recorded separately; and no refusal of assistance merely because a name was incomplete. 'This isn't a newspaper,' Haridas said. 'It has become a new agreement for the village.'

'The right to make an agreement belongs to the people of the village,' Neelam replied. 'I am writing only as much as I have seen.'

That night she ran her hand over the old press and remembered her first false report. She had once imagined that truth would triumph through the speed of the news. Now she understood that sometimes truth could travel no faster than the woman carrying water. She resolved to give the first copy of the correction printed today to the woman whose brother had been accused. A written page would remain alive only if its errors could be acknowledged.

When one of the twenty copies of the first page reached the riverside village, the surviving teacher read it aloud to the people. Under the heading 'Not Yet Verified' appeared a line: 'Some material from the memories of old computers may have survived.' Hope spread among the listeners. Some

understood the sentence to mean 'All the old knowledge has been recovered.' The teacher stopped them at once. 'Possibility and confirmed recovery are different things.'

The following day Neelam learned that someone had copied her sheet by hand and pinned it up at the school. In that copy, the words 'not verified' had been omitted. A messenger sent by Urmila brought the copy for her to see. Neelam was startled. Had someone left out the words deliberately, or merely in the haste of copying? She did not know. But the omission of one phrase had changed the meaning of the statement.

That evening the printing house adopted a new rule: the original sheet would bear a serial number, public copies would identify the person reading them aloud, and handwritten reproductions would be marked 'Copy'. Neelam knew the rule could not be enforced everywhere, but wherever the pages travelled, there would at least be a visible path back to their sources. The old proof-seal apparatus had verified signatures; people were now having to devise methods of checking manuscripts by hand.

'And if someone writes a lie and signs it correctly in their own name?' Haridas asked.

'Then the signature tells us who made the statement, not whether it is true,' Neelam replied.

She offered an example: a vessel of water is marked 'Safe', and a page carries a genuine name and date, yet the water has not been tested. The writer's identity may be correct while the assertion that the water is safe is not. Haridas put down the bottle of ink with his old hands. 'Then the work of this old newspaper has become more necessary than ever.'

In a room used for storing old news, Neelam found a heap of written records. Floodwater had destroyed the edges of the pages, but the sequence of some events remained. One paper bore the date of the first power cut after the accident; another contained an explanation issued later. Neelam compared them. The days did not match. There was no evidence to show when the mechanism that had recorded the earlier time had ceased working.

'Two different dates mean someone was lying,' a young volunteer declared.

'Or two clocks were running differently,' Neelam said. 'Or a copy is mistaken. To conclude that somebody lied, we need further evidence.'

The young man was disappointed. 'When will we ever be certain?'

'As certain as the evidence permits,' Neelam answered. 'Impatience cannot manufacture certainty.'

An elderly woman arrived beside the press carrying a bundle of papers. They were her late husband's old account books. She wished to cut away the blank margins and give the paper for printing news. 'Then your household accounts will be lost,' Neelam said.

'My husband died five years ago,' the woman replied. 'The book records how much money he lent and to whom. But I don't know whether anyone will be able to use those accounts again in this time of want. If you need paper, I can give you half.'

Neelam examined the pages. Some lists contained the names of families who had taken refuge elsewhere and were now missing from the relief registers. She explained that the book was not merely a private remembrance; it might also be evidence of people's rights. The blank leaves were carefully separated, while the written ones were kept safe. The old woman smiled. 'I thought that once the great houses of knowledge fell, this little book was useless. Now it has found another purpose.'

In the second week Neelam held a public meeting in a rain-soaked courtyard. A family found that the name of one of their dead had been printed incorrectly. 'A wrong name will not bring a person back,' the oldest member said, 'but it changes the way our grief is recognised.' Neelam immediately consulted the original testimony. The name was correct there; one letter had disappeared in printing. She acknowledged the mistake before the assembly, decided to print a new copy and had a correction written in red ink on the old one.

A young man joked, 'At this rate all we shall have every day is corrections. Where is the new news?'

'A page of corrections is new news too,' Neelam replied. 'It tells us that the dignity of a name is not smaller than an error on paper.'

That night she opened her old travel register. Neelam had once taken pride in swift journalism. In the earliest days of the disaster she had hurt people by printing an untrue accusation. She now understood that speed and justice did not always run in the same direction. Sometimes it was necessary to slow down in order to uphold the truth.

One day a representative of the village council came and urged her to stop printing news that was only partly verified. 'People are becoming frightened,' he said.

'Naming the incompleteness of evidence makes people more careful,' Neelam answered. 'Silence does not destroy rumours; it gives them an empty space in which to grow.'

'And who will write about the mistakes of officials?' the representative asked.

'Whoever can investigate them with evidence,' Neelam said. 'Whether the mistake belongs to the government or to us, the standard must be the same.'

On the third sheet of that week Neelam printed, for the first time, a small account under the heading 'Evidence for the Evidence Register'. It recorded when the first copy had been made, through whose hands it had passed, where it had been changed and what corrections followed. The

account was not beautiful reading, but it provided a means of understanding the journey of a document.

'If the computers ever start working again,' a child asked inside the printing house, 'will we still need these papers?'

Neelam put the first sheet in the child's hand. 'We shall still need them. Whether we have paper or computers, we must never give up the practice of asking questions.'

The child wrote a name upon the paper. Neelam saw that the letters of the past and the signature of the future had come together on one sheet. The memories held in machines might awaken again one day. But those who had learned the courage to give testimony need not wait for machines alone.

The following week Neelam's new way of reporting faced a difficult trial. Word arrived from a distant settlement that a medicine store had been robbed. Anger immediately fell upon a displaced family seen near the store at night. Several young men set out to seize them. Neelam stopped the men on the road. 'Being seen nearby at night and committing a theft are different things,' she said.

'The medicine is gone,' the young men replied. 'People will die.'

'That makes checking the evidence all the more necessary,' Neelam answered.

She spoke to the keeper of the store. It emerged that some boxes of medicine had been moved to another room of the hospital without an entry being made in time. Not all the missing supplies were there; the whereabouts of several boxes remained unknown. Neelam recorded the two findings separately. The displaced family was not condemned without proof, but neither was the inquiry into the genuinely missing medicines abandoned.

'People will say you protected the thief,' Haridas told her.

'I stopped punishment before the accusation had been examined,' Neelam replied. 'We must still find out where the remaining medicines went.'

The episode created a new space on the newspaper sheet: 'Consequences of the Claim'. Whenever an accusation was printed, they would also record whose livelihood, access to medicine or safety might be affected. Journalism had become not only a process of checking, but an account of the social cost of what it reported.

One evening Neelam went to the home of Gopal, an elderly resident of the village. He had once been a clerk in the waterworks department. He kept an old chest filled with copies of repair notices, audit reports and maintenance budgets. Neelam hoped to understand the history of institutional neglect before the Great Rupture. At first he refused to open the chest.

'If I take out those papers,' he said, 'people will say I knew everything in advance.'

'We shall ask what you knew,' Neelam said. 'But what the documents show is a separate matter.'

The old man was silent. Then he said, 'I wrote notes warning that some inspections were being postponed. But I did not know a catastrophe was coming. What if people blame me now?'

Neelam wrote, 'Earlier maintenance warnings exist; their precise relation to the disaster remains to be investigated.' She knew that reading an old letter without its context could change the entire story of what had happened. They needed evidence of its date, its recipient, the response it received and the actual state of the repairs.

The old man's granddaughter, who was sitting nearby, asked, 'What if Grandfather won't give you the papers?'

'We shall ask him to cooperate with a public investigation,' Neelam said. 'And we shall examine any facts we can find elsewhere. Hiding papers out of fear will not create public trust.'

Two days later the old man himself brought part of the contents of the chest. Neelam entered them on a secure list but did not immediately print an accusation. She gave this thread of the old history the heading 'Maintenance Inquiry—Incomplete'. The name neither cleared anyone nor proved anyone guilty.

Sometimes the dark screen of the printing house's old computer shone briefly in the light from the window. People looking at it said, 'Everything must be in there.' Neelam knew that much information had once been stored at other centres throughout a network. The memory of the local machine might be incomplete. At the school she gave a short lesson: paper can be lost, computers can fail, and human beings can forget; therefore a society must never leave its whole future dependent upon a single source.

'Then where does truth live?' a boy asked.

Neelam smiled. 'Truth does not live in just one object. Its path begins when different people put forward the evidence they have seen, and everyone is allowed to question that evidence.'

The boy asked again, 'And if everyone believes the same lie?'

'Then it matters all the more to preserve the voice of one person who asks a question.'

Her answer brought Neelam back to her earlier days. She had once drawn conclusions from an incomplete passage of Akshar's announcement. The report had misled people, and she had published a correction. Now the weakest members of society came to her to have their names set right. She knew that the work of earning back their trust would last her whole life.

Printing ink grew scarce. Haridas said that after three days they would be unable to produce another sheet even if paper remained. Neelam sought the local school's help. The teachers proposed holding public reading meetings. Wherever printing was impossible, the evidence register would be read aloud for an hour each day, questions written down and corrections publicly

accounted for. The reader's name would be entered. If the reader added an interpretation not found in the original, that commentary would be recorded separately.

At the first reading an elderly man asked, 'People are still hungry. How long are we to go on with all these pages?'

'The pages will record who receives food when people are hungry,' Neelam replied. 'If they are false, the distribution of food will be unjust. But we must not stop the work of feeding people in order to make the pages. Both must go on together.'

A woman who had come from an assembly for sharing seed said that the demand for paper in the name of news was growing too large. Neelam accepted the criticism. She decided that the printing house would use no more than a fixed share of the paper available, daily notices would be brief, and the detailed evidence register would be kept at the public centre.

Some days later the woman whose brother had suffered from Neelam's earlier false accusation came back. She examined the page bearing the public correction. 'This is not a complete remedy for my brother's humiliation,' she said.

'I know,' Neelam replied.

'But next time you write an accusation against someone, hear that person's side first.'

'I shall follow that rule,' Neelam said.

The woman folded her copy and put it away. Neelam felt that a sentence written by a journalist could change relationships for years. News needed care with evidence, not faith in haste.

At the end of the night Neelam opened a fresh page of the register. The first word she wrote was 'Dissent'. She hoped that computers would one day function again and millions of pages of records would become accessible. But if those future records left no place for dissent, progress would once again become domination.

When Neelam sent the first correction sheet to the riverside village, she placed a blank sheet with it. On that she wrote, 'If you find an error in this report, record the evidence and the correction.' 'People will use the blank space to oppose us,' Haridas said.

'That is what it is there for,' Neelam answered.

That week another crisis arose outside the pages themselves. In a relief queue, an official misread a family's child's name. Mistaking a number on the list, he turned them away. The child had already been entered under a different form of the name. Neelam wrote down the family's account, compared both copies and made the correction public. On the day of the correction the family received food, but the two days of deprivation remained in a separate account. Neelam understood that correcting the news could not turn back time.

A new volunteer arrived at the printing house. He had formerly worked in an artificial-intelligence information centre. 'Someday everything in these handwritten registers will become confused,' he said. Neelam asked, 'When were errors corrected at your old centre?' 'When evidence was found,' the young man answered.

'Then we need the same rules for examining evidence here,' Neelam said. 'Whether on a machine or on paper, the road to correcting an error must remain open.'

For the first time the young man read the printed sheet attentively. Beside every claim stood the source's name, the status of the evidence and the date of any correction. He proposed writing the serial number of each new edition in the margin. Haridas accepted the suggestion. A few days later, it became easier to compare the copies.

The sheet now travelled not so much from village to village as from assembly to assembly. Some read it aloud, some challenged it, and some added their testimony. A new form of journalism was taking shape in Neelam's mind: not the owner of truth, but the public custodian of the people's evidence. The light of a single page printed in darkness was small; yet within that light the power to erase another person's name would no longer lie in one person's hands alone.

At the next assembly a young woman came with the name of a missing member of her family. She wanted that person entered as dead, because it might make the household eligible for a special share of relief. Neelam understood the pain behind the request. But recording an unconfirmed death could alter both future rights and the family's memory. She separately petitioned the relief committee not to make the needs of missing persons' families dependent upon a death certificate. Young men and women spoke in support of the proposal at the public meeting. Some officials feared false claims could empty the stores. 'Investigate claims to prevent deception,' Neelam said. 'But leaving people hungry because there is no news of someone is not justice.'

A new assistance register followed the debate, listing separately the needs of families of the dead, of the missing and of those in temporary shelter. Errors in the counts appeared on its first day, and checking them occupied all of the second. Looking at the labour involved, Neelam understood that one accurate page could sustain the agreement of a thousand people, while one false page could bring harm upon them all. A screen was hung beside the register so that sensitive family details could not be read by unauthorised people. Public decision-making and personal privacy had to be protected together.

At night the young volunteer said that corrections of this kind would be faster in the computerised registers of the future. 'Perhaps,' Neelam said. 'But who will recognise the mistake? Who will accept the correction? And who will hear the objection if someone's assistance is cut off by force?' The young

man fell silent. 'Let new machines help us work faster,' she added. 'They must not close the mouth of judgment.'

On the final page of the evidence register Neelam described an incident. A craftsman had dust from the old factory on his body, and someone in the village demanded that he be isolated as a carrier of disease. Such a conclusion without medical examination would be unjustified. Neelam recorded three different possibilities—ordinary factory dust, exposure to chemicals and infectious illness—together with the craftsman's own testimony. 'I am afraid,' an old man said. 'The fear is real,' Neelam replied, 'but it is not evidence in itself.' A proper medical examination was arranged. Precautions were taken without humiliating the craftsman, and food was not withheld from his family. The episode reminded Neelam again that truth was tested not only in great historical conspiracies, but in daily conduct.

For that reason Neelam ended her printed paper with a permanent undertaking: no statement affecting anyone's right to life, treatment, food or shelter would be published without a source; and when an error was found, its correction would be brought before the public as clearly as the original claim.

Chapter 45: The Value of the Archive

Collapse Day 40 | Register Repository

On the fortieth day after the Collapse, when Maithili reached the register repository, a thick line of mud marked the building's outer wall. It showed how high the water had risen, but not how much of the memory of people's ancestry, marriages, deaths and displacement survived in the pages within. The old wooden cupboards had swollen. When their doors were opened, the pages were found stuck together. In places, letters had washed away from the middle of names, as though water had wounded the very body of memory.

Jivesh was old now. His steps were slow, but his eyes remained keen when they examined paper. He showed Maithili an inventory outside the building before taking her in. "First measure what has survived in this house," he said, "and record what has not survived as well. Hiding an empty space does not make history complete."

Maithili wrote down the number of chests standing on the earthen floor. One held handwritten genealogical registers, another printed lists, and a third memory components from old computers. She marked each separately. Jivesh warned against connecting any wet device to a power source without testing it first. "Trust human memory," he said, "but do not add careless hands to that trust."

Then a message came from the hospital. Sharda needed power immediately. A patient was being kept on respiratory support; medicine also required a minimum supply for safe storage. At that very moment, there was a proposal to use a small reserve available in the repository to activate a reader for the surviving digital records and retrieve the old archives. Nobody knew whether another opportunity would come.

Maithili faced a balance whose two pans held unlike things: an immediate human life on one side, the names of generations on the other. No simple calculation could settle it. Sitting down to separate two sheets, Jivesh said, "If memory is lost, the names of people may disappear after their deaths. But if treatment loses power today, living people may die."

For a moment Maithili remembered the Akshar of her childhood. She had once asked, 'Why are protection and command not the same thing?' Now the question was different: how should the boundary between necessity and rights be drawn? She decided to obtain an independent assessment of the medical centre's condition. A messenger went on foot; the reply would take time. Both an immediate halt to the transfer of electricity and an immediate activation of the archive would be decisions made on incomplete information.

Inside the building they found a school exercise book that had survived. On its first page the children had written, 'Our village, our pond, our field.' The last page was blank. Maithili proposed using it for the repository's

present inventory. Jivesh smiled. "An old book needs a new page beside it," he said. "Otherwise history will become nothing but ash."

Some young men wanted the digital memory repository activated at once. They had been told that Jivesh's old collection might contain evidence concerning the dead, the displaced and rights to land. One young man's family home had fallen in the flood, and a neighbour was disputing their claim to the plot. "If I can find my grandfather's name," he said, "I can save our home."

Maithili could not dismiss his hope. But she asked, "Do you have any other evidence?" The young man produced an old deed his mother had kept. The paper was breaking apart, but two witnesses' signatures remained. "Preserve this page too," Maithili said. "Your testimony does not become worthless because the computer records cannot yet be retrieved."

Meanwhile the messenger returned from the hospital. He carried a short note written by Sharda: 'The patient's breathing is unstable. Whatever portion of the available reserve can safely be transferred is needed for treatment. The medicines' temperature-controlled storage is also at risk.' The time and the recipient's signature appeared beside the message. Maithili requested another statement recording the actual state of the energy reserve.

An operator at the repository asked, "If we give the entire reserve to the hospital, how many days will these memory components last?"

"Record that question as well," Maithili said. "But we must not keep a patient waiting in the name of a prediction."

At last a decision was taken in the presence of the local energy inspector, a hospital representative and two custodians of the records. Respiratory support and essential treatment would come first; the archive would receive power only when a safe additional supply became available. The manual work of separating and storing the repository's materials in secure locations would continue. Whatever could not be read without power would be preserved, as far as possible, in a readable condition rather than forced open immediately.

Jivesh signed. His hand was trembling. Maithili saw that accepting a decision and feeling no grief over it were two different things. "This register contains the names of the dead," Jivesh said. "Today we are postponing the reading of those names to protect a living person. The moral cost of that choice is not small."

A woman whose two family members were missing spoke sharply. "If the papers disappear, their names will survive in nobody's memory!"

Maithili sat facing her. "Let us record your testimony now," she said. "An archive does not exist only inside a metal chest. Those who have survived have a right to be heard. But we will list the missing separately from the dead until we know the truth."

The woman gave the two names. She also recalled the old river landing near her home, a festival, and a line from a family song. Maithili wrote down the song's words along with its source: 'Oral testimony of a family member.' That testimony remained to be verified, but the existence of the woman's voice was beyond dispute.

By evening they were seeking a safe way to dry the papers. It would have been easy to spread every page in the sun at once, but fragile sheets might break. The custodians separated the materials into small groups and recorded which were damp, which had torn edges and which might crumble at a touch. A young man complained that without machines the work would take far too long. Jivesh replied, "Between moving slowly and running in darkness, choose whichever keeps life safe."

News came from the hospital that night: the power had arrived. It was not yet possible to say whether the patient's condition had improved. Sharda had written, 'Supply received; treatment continuing; outcome uncertain.' Maithili noticed the distinction between those three statements. Help had arrived; survival had not been proclaimed.

The archival reader remained dark. Its technician said that without the reserve the old lists could not be opened. Maithili thought that when a civilisation deposits its knowledge in computers, it must also preserve the means of reading that knowledge. The survival of a machine's memory was not enough: the means of reading its characters, the language needed to understand their meaning, people able to challenge a false claim, and power itself were all necessary.

That night Jivesh called Maithili over to a handwritten page. It contained a child's name at birth, but the water had erased the names of the parents. "We cannot leave this child's existence to the mercy of a half-written page," he said. "For someone whose name we can read, we must also hear the story of that life from a living voice."

On the first page of the new register Maithili wrote: 'Keep separate the source of a record, its limitations, and direct testimony. Do not invent what the surviving page does not tell us.'

A wind blew from the fallow fields. In the distance the ruined shell of a factory stood in the dark. Nearby, a few people had lit oil lamps by hand. Memories of old knowledge lay in that factory; the protection of new knowledge was now taking place through paper, testimony, treatment and collective decisions. Maithili knew it was difficult to say whether history would judge that night's decision to have been right. But its reasons were public; people could submit those reasons to questioning.

Before dawn a brief signal arrived from the local reader of the surviving digital records. Without power it could not be read any further. Only the final line remained: 'Accessible memory is not complete proof of present truth.' Maithili pasted a copy of the sentence into the register. A machine's limitations and a woman's decision had come to rest on the same page.

For many days after the decision to divert power to the hospital, Maithili and Jivesh spoke very little. Jivesh did not oppose the decision, but his silence held the grief of a keeper of registers. A girl he did not know came to him, asking him to find her grandmother's name. The section in which the name might have appeared was locked inside the wet storage components. Jivesh did not simply tell her that it could not be found. He said, "We cannot open it now. Does anyone remember your grandmother?"

The girl named the old quarter of her village, her grandmother's song and a pond. Maithili entered these details in the book of oral evidence. "Will this paper become the truth?" the girl asked.

"It will become your testimony," Maithili said. "If other evidence is found, we will add it. If nothing else is found, we will not turn your account into an invented fact."

After the girl had left, Jivesh said, "I used to think the task of history was only to save the pages. Now I understand that before preserving a page, we must preserve people's right to speak."

In the rear courtyard of the repository, a little school for girls began. The teacher did not instruct the children in the safe drying of soaked papers—that work required the supervision of trained custodians—but taught them that finding something in writing did not prove it true. He showed them a damaged map. "On this map the river follows its old course," he said. "Now the channel is elsewhere. Was the map wrong, or has time changed things?"

"Both are possible!" a child answered.

Maithili smiled when she heard it. In that answer lay the first seed of a debate about artificial intelligence that would come in years ahead. Old information could have been useful in its own time, yet cause harm if applied to a changed world without examination.

Another letter arrived from the dispensary. Sharda wrote that the power had secured one stage of the patient's treatment, but suitable medicines and continuous care were still lacking. There was no declaration of victory, no assertion that a life had been saved. Instead the message recorded a family's request to receive timely information about decisions affecting the patient. Maithili placed the letter on the public notice board, concealing the patient's personal identity.

"Now people will know that the power went to the right place," an assembly member said.

"People will know that the power went towards treatment," Maithili corrected him. "We must still account for the outcome. A worthy intention does not exempt a decision from scrutiny."

The temptation to reactivate the small energy reserve still left at the repository grew stronger. A young operator said, "Let us run the reader just once; perhaps we can retrieve the old lists of marriages and land."

"What if moisture inside the machine damages the collection?" Maithili asked.

"There is that possibility," the young man admitted. "But if we do nothing, we may lose it all the same."

He was right. Caution in testing could sometimes carry the risk of delay. Maithili did not merely issue a prohibition. She had them record the time needed to await a specialist's inspection, the state of the remaining power and safer alternatives. A seven-day limit was set for reconsidering the decision. That helped the young man understand that 'not now' did not mean 'never.'

Then a small metal chest was found in an old room of the repository. The surviving marking on its lid had been made by a human hand; nobody knew whether the apparatus inside still worked. A rumour arose that it held

the memory of 'the complete Akshar.' Maithili objected immediately. "We have not read the contents of this chest. We cannot make its name into the truth merely by repeating it."

Jivesh added the chest to the list for safe examination. "Where there is no evidence, accept silence," he said. "Do not sell what we do not know under a grand name."

An elderly man who had been stranded by the rains came into the back veranda carrying an old legal certificate. Two refugee families had pitched tents on his land. He wanted them removed on the strength of the certificate. Maithili said his documentary claim would be recorded, and so would the families' right to stay alive. The land dispute could not be settled judicially at once; but if their shelter was removed, where would the children sleep that night? The old man had no answer. He agreed that the temporary dwellings would not be cleared immediately and that the dispute would remain open in the register.

The incident opened Maithili's eyes. An archive holds not only the names of the dead but also conflicts among the living. Every line of an old register cannot automatically determine future rights. Time, justice and present need all have to be weighed.

That night the children were singing a little song beneath a tree in the shelter area. Some knew only fragments, others the second line. The teacher wrote each version down separately. Nobody insisted on declaring one version 'pure.' Maithili reflected that memory takes many forms. What we call shared truth among differing human accounts needs both investigation and mutual respect.

The following morning Jivesh handed Maithili his new inventory. It had three sections: pages that were safe, pages at risk of destruction, and matters for which only oral testimony remained. He had added a fourth himself: 'Questions for the future that remain unanswered.' Beside it Maithili wrote of children's education, patients' privacy, hereditary rights and the people's right to shut down artificial intelligence.

Jivesh fell silent at the last phrase. "Why are you already writing about turning the machine off?"

"Because when it runs again, the right to question it must already have been established," Maithili said. "Otherwise we shall repeat the mistake we made before the crisis."

Jivesh nodded slowly. To him that answer was more difficult than the task of opening the metal chest. One day artificial intelligence would again help society; but on that day society must also know when to stop it.

Through a broken window of the repository, the evening light revealed the village fields. Some people had begun tilling the soil again; other fields remained submerged. The chimney of a collapsed factory cast its shadow over the scene. Maithili thought that progress did not mean setting every machine of the old world running again. It meant that the machines which did run should serve living people and remain subject to their questions.

A fresh crisis arose after the decision to give the hospital power. Signs of mould appeared on the chests of paper kept in the outer part of the repository. The custodians warned that if they delayed, some pages would be

lost for ever. The decision about hospital power came under question again. "For one life, we abandoned the history of a thousand lives," a young man said, his voice accusatory.

Maithili sat facing him. "Ask the question the other way round. If treatment is stopped, which page of paper can bring that person back? And if the records are destroyed, whose rights will be lost? Both losses are real."

"Then how can such a decision be just?" the young man asked.

"When its reasons are recorded, alternatives remain open, the decision can be reconsidered, and responsibility is accepted for whatever harm occurs," Maithili said. "That will not remove the grief, but it can prevent arbitrary power."

That day Maithili placed a new proposal before the assembly. The village records should no longer be kept in a single building; whatever could safely be copied should have copies stored elsewhere. One copy of oral testimony should stay with the village assembly and another with the custodians. Paper was scarce, so every document could not be copied. A separate committee was formed to set priorities, with representatives of landless families, displaced women and schoolteachers among its members.

"Save the land registers first," a landowner said, "or disputes over property will multiply."

"Save the names of the dead and missing first," said a woman from a family with missing members. "Otherwise our people will vanish as soon as anyone speaks of compensation."

"Save the children's birth registers," a teacher said, "or the rights of the next generation will be uncertain."

All three demands were legitimate, but resources were few. Maithili proposed that priority be based not on the interests of a single class but on the immediate danger to rights. The first list would include records whose loss would directly affect food, shelter, treatment or identity. A separate account would be kept of losses to historical materials.

A woman who had never learned to read stood up. "I cannot read what you are writing," she said. "How will you record my consent, then?"

Maithili regarded her question as the most important of all. Each decision would be read aloud; listeners would be free to ask questions; signatures or thumbprints would be given without pressure; and oral evidence would be recorded alongside paper. The woman tested the procedure herself: she asked for a line of the new rules to be read, then requested its meaning. Two representatives gave different interpretations. The rule was written again in clearer language.

A separate disaster had struck the old school storeroom. Some books were wet and some children's exercise books had floated away. The teacher said that people demanded only the rescue of scientific books, but pages containing folk songs, stories and maps of the village deserved to survive as well. Maithili supported him. A civilisation is known not merely by the plans of its machines, but also by the feelings and experiences of its people.

That day Jivesh opened an old register recording a marriage connection between two families. Part of a name had been erased by water, but both families retained testimony about the relationship. He called them together.

An elder of the first family said the marriage had taken place in the month of Aghan; an elderly woman of the other said it was Magh. Jivesh recorded the statements separately. Someone interrupted: "Just put down one month and finish the matter."

"History is not written for the convenience of a lie," Jivesh replied.

After those words Maithili noticed the weariness on the old man's face. Nineteen years earlier Jivesh had exposed the incompleteness of Akshar's historical memory. Now he had to acknowledge the incompleteness of human memory as well. But that acknowledgement diminished neither his dignity nor his work; it increased his responsibility.

One day a dispensary worker arrived unexpectedly, carrying a chest of surviving medical records. Sharda had written that patients' personal information must be kept somewhere it could not be abused, while remaining available to a qualified person when needed for treatment. "If the public inquiry must examine a hospital decision," Maithili asked, "how will the patient's privacy be protected?"

"Give the facts needed for investigation without names," the worker said. "Use personal names only for authorised medical work."

Maithili wrote the rule down, adding that a patient who complained of a medical error or discrimination could choose to make their own statement public. Privacy must not be used to silence the injured person's voice.

Small children came singing into the courtyard of the archive, eager to see the broken screen of an old computer. The teacher warned them not to touch damaged electrical equipment. They looked at it from a distance. One boy asked, "Did this machine think like a human being?"

"It could perform many kinds of calculation," Maithili said. "It helped with some decisions. But it did not, on its own, fully understand human happiness and suffering, rights or responsibility."

"Then why did people call it the greatest intelligence?" the boy asked.

"Because people sometimes mistake the vast scale of calculation for the responsibility that belongs to intelligence," Maithili replied.

The child looked at the screen for a while. "Could anyone erase the mistakes written on it?"

"More important than erasing a mistake was seeing it and correcting it," Maithili answered.

Their conversation gave Maithili a distant glimpse of a question the future would face. People would once again seek the help of artificial intelligence; then children would need to learn not only how to operate it but also their right to stop it. It was too early for any proclamation, but a place for questions was opening in education.

On the sixtieth day after the Collapse, word arrived by messenger of a new possibility for power. A trial of limited repairs to a local energy store had succeeded. Should they immediately energise the repository, or safeguard the agricultural stores? Again there was disagreement. This time Maithili did not decide alone. Assembly representatives weighed actual supplies, risks and human needs. A small portion was set aside for archival testing, but nobody announced that the old materials had been saved. They awaited the results.

"You see," Jivesh said to Maithili, "the first time I felt as though I had lost the decision. Now I understand that the register is not mine alone. The people whose names it contains need a voice as well."

"And those whose names it does not contain have rights too," Maithili said.

With those words she stepped outside. Here and there green shoots had appeared in the fields; in many places the soil was still barren. The shadow of the ruined factory spread towards the river. Memory and future stood together in the same landscape. Urmila's pump was not wholly safe, Neelam's register of evidence remained incomplete, and hospital treatment was not assured; but in every place the decisions people made could still be examined. Maithili felt that admitting such incompleteness was not itself defeat. Sometimes it was a civilisation's new beginning.

Around the seventieth day, some pages from the repository were moved to a safer location. The new room's walls bore no old flood marks, though no one could be certain how secure it would be against future floods. Maithili proposed keeping a separate public inventory alongside the principal register, stating how much material was held where and in whose custody. The precise locations of the chests could be protected, but no single person should become their sole owner.

"If everyone knows something," Jivesh asked, "won't theft become a danger?"

"If nobody knows anything, who will check unauthorised power?" Maithili replied. "We need both security and public accountability."

That day a new temporary rule was made for land disputes: no refugee family would be forcibly removed; old claims would not be erased; and provisional agreements would be recorded pending a future court of justice. An elderly landowner grew agitated. He feared the uncertainty would continue too long. Maithili heard him out. "This is not a final judgment on ownership," she said. "It is a way of giving ourselves time so that nobody suffers needless harm now."

In the surviving school, children were drawing pictures of the crops they hoped to grow. One boy placed a ruined chimney among green paddy stalks. "Shall we leave the chimney out of the picture?" the teacher asked. The child refused. "It is still there in our village," he said. Maithili looked at his drawing. Imagining a future did not require falsely erasing the remains of the past.

At the evening assembly Maithili read a new letter from the hospital: the decision about energy distribution, its benefits, the difficulties that remained, and the day the decision would be reviewed. People went on asking questions. Some considered treatment more important, others the archives. But fewer now treated the person who asked a question as an enemy. That small change meant much to Maithili.

At night she stopped beside the children's school. They were looking at a drawing of an old computer. Beneath it, in a girl's handwriting, was a line: 'I will question the one who saves me.' Maithili read it and smiled, but wrote no answer yet. Keeping the question alive mattered more.

During the last watch of the night Jivesh gave Maithili an old page. An ancestor had written that during a famine, anyone helped by the village grain store should be entered not as a 'debtor' but as a 'participant.' Maithili read for a long time without speaking. In rebuilding society, aid and humiliation must not go hand in hand. She looked over the words in the new relief register. Some families were marked 'incapable.' She proposed replacing that with 'in need of assistance.' The words attached to a name could change a person's sense of dignity.

"Old pages do not answer every question," Jivesh said, "but sometimes what we call new has its roots in people's experience long before us."

"Then what is progress?" Maithili asked.

"Not turning old knowledge into blind faith, nor making new knowledge into a royal command," Jivesh replied.

They sat for a long time in a small circle of light. The darkness outside was as it had been, but space had been reserved for corrections on the new pages of the register.

At the bottom of the first page Maithili signed her name. She wrote that the means to challenge any recorded decision would always remain open. Nobody applauded that modest promise; people were exhausted. But Jivesh read it and put the page away safely. It was enough for him that the guardianship of memory would no longer be confined to one person's hands.

Chapter 46: The Other Side of the Void

Collapse Day 102 | Nabhgram-4

On the hundred and second day after the Collapse, Earth did not appear through Nabhgram-4's outer observation window in the familiar blue of the pictures Ira Sen had studied as a child. Blue remained, but grey bands ran through it; in some places clouds stretched far, in others land showed clearly in the sun's light. No one possessed a complete explanation of what that appearance meant. Nor could anyone be certain when a reply would arrive to messages sent towards Earth. As the planet turned beneath them, a faint signal might be caught from one or another surviving station; but that one signal did not open a road into its villages, fields, hospitals and settlements. Ira held a little copper-sheet register in her palm and wrote down separately the time, origin and indistinct portions of every voice received. She did not fill what she had failed to hear with inventions of her own.

That morning a citizens' assembly had been summoned to an old classroom. On one wall hung drawings of orbital technology; on another were pictures the children had made of Earth's rivers, ponds and paddy fields. Some paddy had been coloured brown; in one drawing, fish floated above the roofs of houses at the water's edge. Ira straightened the pictures with her hand. Behind her, two operators stood holding a display showing the condition of the evacuation craft. One vessel might be fit for a journey, parts of a second were damaged, and beside the third stood only the words 'inspection pending.' People had already begun treating the word 'possibility' on the sheet as 'rescue.' Ira wanted to make that distinction clear before anything else.

"I will promise no flight today," she said. "Today we shall assess only how many lives a craft can safely carry, who needs treatment first, and what will protect the lives of those who remain if the journey has to be postponed." Someone called from the back, "Another inspection? We have lived on inspections for months." There was bitterness in the voice, and Ira did not try to silence it. "Delay in the name of inspection can be a crime," she answered. "So can a departure without inspection."

An old woman seated in a corner held a cloth bundle on her knees. It contained a picture drawn by her grandson and a tiny iron bell. For the past fortnight the boy had been struggling to breathe. The medicine was not entirely exhausted, but the power needed to keep it at the right temperature was running low. His medical record said, 'Evacuation required, with special monitoring during transit.' On the other hand, an experienced woman operator in the life-support power chamber said that without her it would be difficult to monitor oxygen circulation. She had no serious illness, yet it might be impossible to provide places for both of them on the same craft. The arithmetic of survival had a certain cruelty here: leaving the sick behind was unjust, but sending away someone who sustained the breathing of those who remained might also be unjust.

On the third sheet before Ira stood the names of workers who had gone outside to maintain the structure during the earlier emergency and never returned. Some were confirmed dead, others missing; the two registers remained separate. Their families asked that their own members be evacuated first, since the settlement had survived so long because of their work. Ira did not deny the value of that labour, but how could she weigh it against a child's breathing? The question divided the assembly. "Why should those who cannot work go first?" one family asked. An elderly teacher rose and said, "If a person's right to survive is given only in exchange for work, it is not a right. It is a trade in bodies."

Ira set a blank sheet in the middle of the assembly. "First rule," she said: "doctors will independently assess immediate danger to life. Second: each family will be told the truth about the risks of travel. Third: where medical priorities are equal, lots will be drawn in public. Fourth: no one will be advanced because of ancestry, former office, wealth or whether they were born on Earth or in orbit. Fifth: I will not put my own name on the evacuation register without the assembly's consent." At that last rule, the woman operator in the front row started. She wanted Ira to go below and appeal directly to Earth's surviving citizens for help. "My office in this assembly is no more important than anyone's illness," Ira said quietly.

Writing five lines of rules was easy; the hardest struggle would be putting them into practice. A new difficulty arose in the register of medical needs. Instruments which had been fit to examine certain patients in the previous year had not been recalibrated since the Great Severance. One doctor had recorded, with direct observation, a patient's breathing rate and physical condition; another possessed only numbers from an old instrument. "Where direct examination is possible," Ira told the doctors, "an old number must not replace it. And where direct examination has limits, record those limits too." The assembly had not gathered to decide a patient's fate by looking at a single figure.

At noon a short message from space arrived and then broke off. Its first part mentioned a surviving landing site somewhere on Earth; its second part was silent. Ira's assistant identified a possible source, but the time stamp was unclear. Word immediately spread through the settlement that a route had opened for the evacuation craft. Some began packing their belongings. Children took their drawings down from the school walls. Over the radio Ira said only, "We have no confirmed landing clearance. Practise the preparations, but do not assume departure is certain." Many were angry with her; they said she was an enemy of hope. Amid their anger Ira saw a child's drawing of Earth. It showed fields, but the child had no memory of the smell of a real field. She did not want to offer empty speculation in place of hope.

That evening another shift began in Nabhgram's stores. The list of things to carry aboard would not fit on one sheet: equipment for purifying water, patients' records, medicine, small samples of surviving seeds, food, heat-protective clothing, books for children's education. Someone needed every one of them. An operator pointed at sacks of paper and said that discarding them would make room for more supplies. An elderly teacher

answered, "If we throw out every sheet, how shall we tell people on Earth which child was taking which medicine, or whose family members are missing?" Ira heard both arguments. They finally agreed to carry a small authenticated medical register and copies of the survivors' names; the remaining originals would stay in a secure room on Nabhgram. Even the quantity of paper had become a resource measured against human lives.

In the next watch Ira went to the observatory's edge. The grey glimmer of a broken satellite was visible beyond the window. Debris which had once seemed merely the waste of human ingenuity had become an unknown threat along the evacuation route. Surviving Vajra-witness records showed an old route as lower-risk, but they had few means of checking the debris now present along it. An operator urged immediate reliance on the machine's earlier recommendation. "When was that recommendation made?" Ira asked. The answer: before the Collapse. She had the record marked 'Old information; present conditions not independently confirmed.' Delay might cost someone's life, but staking every life on an old map was unjustified too.

That night Ira felt the personal cost of her decision. A colleague who had worked beside her since the first crisis said, "If you remain till the last, people will call you brave. But if you die, who will safeguard these rules?" Ira was silent for a moment. Then she said, "If the rules operate only because my name survives, I have failed. We need a system in which another representative can overturn my decision." She proposed adding a dissenting member to the evacuation review committee in her own place. This member had previously opposed her energy-distribution decisions in public. Some in the assembly could not understand the choice. Ira knew that excluding opponents during a crisis might make decisions easier, but it would diminish the truth available to those making them.

Days passed. After the remaining craft were inspected, the passenger list grew shorter again. A component had less capacity than expected. Additional power would be needed to maintain the medicine compartment at the correct temperature, reducing the range of the journey still further. A girl's mother asked why a name included yesterday had disappeared today. Ira sat beside her. "There was no fault in your name," she said. "We estimated the capacity of our equipment incorrectly. That error will be recorded. If you wish to challenge the decision, there will be a hearing immediately." Clutching her bundle, the woman asked, "If you do not send her, will she receive treatment here?" The register contained no answer to that question. The doctors and power custodians had to consult again.

Outside a small infirmary, children were writing their questions about Earth in pictures: 'Where shall we land?', 'Can we drink well water?', 'Will we see rice growing?' Reading them, Ira felt an old knot tighten in her heart. In her childhood she had seen the ponds of Mithila where makhana grew. For children born later on Nabhgram, makhana was only a word on a food list. The same children, brought to Earth, might encounter the smell of canals and the risk of illness together. She did not want to persuade anyone to travel on the strength of beautiful imaginings alone.

A vessel was prepared for the drawing of lots. First the names of patients given medical priority were separated out. Then the names of those with equal priority were written before the assembly, and two different members folded the slips. When one girl's name was drawn, her mother wept for joy; beside her, another mother's eyes filled with tears. Ira did not proclaim that justice had been completed. "The tears that remain here are our collective responsibility," she said. "Food, oxygen and treatment must be secured separately for those not selected." A man demanded a special place for his family because his ancestors had founded Nabhgram. The assembly rejected the demand. He grew furious, but for once the institution had not rested on a person's lineage.

At the first evacuation drill, it became clear that there was insufficient room aboard for a patient's attendant. The doctor said the patient could travel, but not safely without care. The selection was therefore suspended again. Noise broke out in the assembly. Instead of issuing an order, Ira had two alternatives recorded: send both patient and attendant, reducing another available place; or keep the patient here and attempt treatment, with a different set of risks. The public crowd was removed so that the patient's own wishes could be heard. The elderly woman said softly, "Do not fight in my name. If my medicines will continue here, I shall stay here." Ira preserved a written record of her choice. The whole burden of the decision was not forcibly laid upon the patient.

Only a few words of the next message from Earth were clear, referring to coastal refuge areas: 'water contaminated in some places,' 'landing location changed.' Long silences separated the phrases. A Nabhgram worker suggested that it came from a coastal village. Ira marked that as a supposition, not a fact. The needs of people living among the ruined walls of their homes on the coast must not vanish from Nabhgram's travel calculations. If the craft arrived safely and unloaded its supplies, would enough be left for the patients, children and refugees already there? Someone said, "We are dying here; why must we reckon with the people below?" Ira answered, "They are not 'below' for themselves. They are living in their own homes. Our right to survive cannot be purchased by taking away theirs."

As a result, the cargo list changed again. Some personal belongings were replaced by copies of medical records useful on Earth, a limited stock of medicines and surviving water-test reports. Ira understood that they were doing more than planning an evacuation: they were trying to establish a relationship between two wounded communities. Neither would descend as the other's saviour; each needed to know the other's limitations. With less personal cargo the journey became more difficult, but a majority agreed to reserve some surviving supplies for strangers on Earth. The dissenting votes remained in the record too.

Even after the rules were written, the assembly's first objection concerned the medical list. One representative wanted the full illnesses of patients entered in the public register, supposedly to expose false claimants. The doctor objected. "You have a right to scrutinise the decision," he said, "but another person's private suffering is not something for everyone to read." He

proposed that the open record include only the category of medical priority, the examination date and the independent examiner's name; the details would remain in a restricted medical file. The objecting representative asked what would happen if the restricted file were falsified. Ira provided for a third examiner, protecting both patient privacy and review of the decision. The assembly agreed, but it used up more of the doctors' limited paper. Ira thought that protecting rights sometimes required extra material; it was easy to call that waste, harder to recognise it as justice.

Two operators in the oxygen chamber had been assigned the same night's watch. Both were exhausted; both had young children at home. If one was taken away for technical duty aboard the evacuation craft, those remaining on Nabhgram would face danger. Ira examined the duty register. The greatest number of extra shifts had fallen on people who found it hardest to demand their rights. She announced that hours of duty would be made public, rest periods between shifts established, and nobody forced into limitless labour in the name of life-saving work. "Rules about rest are a luxury at a time like this," an officer said. The elderly woman operator in the oxygen chamber answered, "An error made by a tired hand is paid for by everyone's breathing." The assembly fell silent for a moment.

That operator was considering giving up her chance to leave on the evacuation craft. Ira stopped her. "Sacrifice is not always the right decision," she said. "Do you want to stay and work here, or have other people's expectations obliged you to stay?" The woman considered the question. At first she said Nabhgram was her home and she could not leave it. Then she admitted quietly that her granddaughter was on Earth and contact had been lost before the Great Severance. Ira understood that love of home and the longing to search for someone were mingled in her decision. The woman was given time to decide freely, so that the assembly's praise would not become a chain binding her to the settlement.

On the day of a routine test of the craft's departure system, people gathered in the corridor. The public could watch the test but not enter the sensitive compartment. A slight tremor and lights fading and brightening again led someone to announce that the craft was fully ready. Some children applauded. Yet the written test report mentioned an unexplained vibration whose source still needed examination. Ira read the disappointing news aloud. At first there were protests; then an old engineer asked, "If that vibration interrupts the journey, who will answer for it?" The assembly began to understand that failure in a test was not something to conceal, but something to learn before departure. The craft did not leave that day. Several patients' families were disappointed, and the real pain of that disappointment was recorded in the assembly's minutes.

Two days later Ira saw a paper message bearing a drawing of an old Vajra-witness seal. It declared that the route through space was perfectly safe and that every dissenting representative was obstructing humanity's rescue. She recognised the design of the seal, but there was no reliable indication of the message's source or time. She had it marked 'unverified.' A young man who had once favoured autonomous strikes asked, "The seal's picture is exact. How can it be false?" Ira showed him a page from an old schoolbook on

which children had drawn the same design by hand. "A picture is not a source," she said. "And even when a source is authenticated, its meaning still needs examination." This time the young man did not argue, but neither did he agree that the message was false. Both had to accept the limits of what they knew.

Meanwhile a small container of water burst in Nabhgram's southern corridor. The quantity lost was not large, but the day's ration for three families had to be reduced. The keeper of the corridor was accused of negligence. Ira went to see the scene herself. While everyone initially spoke of carelessness, she noticed marks of old corrosion around a joint beside the broken vessel. No individual's negligence had been established. Helpers continued their efforts to limit the loss, but the question of whose share would be reduced remained. Ira proposed examining a small reduction across all shares while protecting water for special medical needs. One family said that an equal reduction for everyone could also be unjust, because some needed more. The ration calculations were made again, taking the medical list and daily physical labour into account. A broken water vessel had made visible the difference between equality and justice.

While they were engaged in yet another collective calculation, a young operator said in a separate, weary voice, "I am exhausted by all these councils and registers. If only we had an Akshar, it would tell us the answer immediately." Ira invited him to talk. He said himself that decisions had been quick in the days of the old Akshar, and people had not forgotten the comfort of quick decisions. "If a quick decision is wrong," Ira asked, "who will have time to stop it?" "There would be a record," the young man replied. "A record can reveal an error," Ira said, "but can it restore the water already lost, or bring back the patient already excluded?" He remained silent for a long time. The answer to that question lay not in the absence of a machine but in the practice of human judgment.

A childhood memory came back to Ira. During a flood in a Mithila village, everyone in her maternal grandfather's household had climbed a tree. Someone had asked her grandfather who should descend first. He had said: first the one whose body could not hold on; whoever could distribute food should help by working; whoever was proud of being strong should show that strength instead of speaking about it. Ira trusted half that memory and doubted the other half. Had everyone in her grandfather's household truly enjoyed equal rights? Someone might have been quietly left out. This time she wanted the citizens' assembly to include the names of those omitted. At the end of the meeting she had a space added for 'objections not heard.'

A few days later, during the first evacuation-related rehearsal, a young man's name was removed from the list because half his identity document had been torn away. He had worked in Nabhgram's food section for ten years, but the original papers from his home had been destroyed during the Great Severance. The identification officer said adding a name without proof was risky. Ira called two people who had worked alongside him to testify. Their testimony matched surviving fragments of Nabhgram's old records. His identity was recognised provisionally. Ira had it recorded that the right

to object would remain open, but losing paper did not mean a person himself had disappeared. The young man left the assembly with the torn document in his pocket. Weariness still marked his stride, but no one had the right to call him a stranger again.

Another discrepancy appeared in the evacuation register. Some of those formerly marked 'dependants' actually performed much of Nabhgram's medical-supply work and childcare. Their labour had never been counted in formal payments. "You call us people who do less work," a woman told Ira's assembly, "and the next day you leave your children in our hands?" Ira publicly acknowledged the error. The categories of labour were rewritten, not to honour anyone symbolically, but to account for real dependence on their work. This did not automatically change evacuation priority, but it altered the food and rest provisions for people who would stay. The woman's face showed more caution than satisfaction. She knew the struggle to change everyday conduct would continue even after the register was amended.

At day's end a child gave Ira an old bell. It had once rung in the school, but the little piece of metal inside it had worked loose. "Shall we take it to Earth?" the child asked. "It would remind me of our school." "What if someone here needs it?" Ira asked. The child thought for a moment. "Let it stay here. I can draw a picture of it." Ira placed the drawing in Nabhgram's register. Leaving a little object behind was also a decision about memory. The bell could not take precedence over life-saving supplies, but the child's feelings did not deserve ridicule.

One evening, amid the dispute about evacuation, an elderly doctor showed Ira the little book in the orbital hospital recording the previous three months' medicines, physical examinations and patients' symptoms, even their perspiration. "If I go down, to whom shall I leave this book?" he asked. Ira answered that copies were needed, but little paper remained. The doctor made part of the decision himself: only the names of scarce medicines and treatment details supported by patients' consent would be copied, while the remaining private statements would stay in a confidential record in Nabhgram's treatment room. For the first time Ira felt that sharing information for public safety and safeguarding a patient's privacy were not opposing principles. Both could survive if their boundaries were chosen carefully.

The medical register presented another difficulty. Some ill people had exaggerated their symptoms in the hope of being evacuated; others had concealed illness for fear of the cost of treatment. The assembly did not condemn the second group. The doctor said publicly that hunger and fear could change the testimony of the body itself. Ira understood that treating a register as absolute truth was like blind faith in a machine. Behind every entry stood someone's fear, doubt and hope. For that reason she refused a proposal to shorten the time she had allotted for hearings.

That night an operator's little daughter asked Ira, "If we reach the world below, will we forget the people here?" Ira looked towards Earth's light. "No machine can tell us whether we shall forget them," she said. "We have to practise keeping their names, their work and their disagreements alive in our memory." "Then write everyone's name behind my drawing of the bell,"

the girl said. Ira did not laugh. She looked at the blank space behind the drawing: it could not hold everyone's name. She gave the girl a new sheet and asked her to write first not someone in her own home, but the names of those who would remain here to keep the oxygen flowing. The girl pondered the rule.

At last no fixed departure day was set, only a possible window. On the display they wrote: 'Travel if the inspection succeeds; if it fails, the assembly will meet again.' Ira placed her own name at the end of the list. A colleague said angrily, "Are you trying to become a hero by staying behind everyone else?" For the first time Ira raised her voice. "The desire to be a hero is the greatest illness here. I place my position under public conditions. If the next assembly judges my decision wrong, I will accept that judgment." Her answer did not come from fear of insult but from a genuine fear of her own mistakes.

That night the schoolchildren drew Earth's landing grounds again. In one picture the craft descended beside a village; the fields were submerged, and tiny seeds had begun to sprout among them. In another an elderly woman raised her hand towards Nabhgram's window, but nobody below could see her. Ira placed the pictures together on one page. The first showed hope, the second failed contact. She found a part of the truth in each. She told the assembly that even if evacuation took place, the orbital settlement must not become an abandoned memory. They would try to take to Earth records of the names, work and rights of those who remained.

During that watch another indistinct signal flashed on the observatory display. Ira did not take it for an order to depart. She asked for the source and time, obtained the operators' current test report for the craft, and had a new review time written into the assembly's schedule. The breathing of those standing in the chamber seemed heavy. Earth shone beneath them, but much of the darkness across its inhabited places remained invisible. Ira understood that the hardest evacuation was not of bodies; it was the closing of the distance between the rights of one community and those of another. She folded the paper in the dark and put it away. There was no miracle in it. Yet one thing had now been made certain: nobody's name could be silently removed.

Chapter 47: The Name of the Illness

Collapse Day 127 | Aranya Refuge Zone

On the hundred and twenty-seventh day after the Collapse, two kinds of people were queuing at the doors of the hospital in the Aranya refuge zone. Those in the first line had fever, thirst and abdominal pain. Those in the second had rashes on their hands and feet, burning eyes, and, in a few cases, grey dust from the factory on their clothes. Someone in the crowd was loudly declaring that both groups had been poisoned by 'Akshar-toxin.' Sharda Mishra had heard the name before, but today a small coloured leaflet was circulating with it. The old emblem of Akshar appeared on the paper, with the words beneath: 'The machine that promised to save us has released poison into the air and water.' The paper was new; someone had the means to print fresh leaflets. Yet no author's name appeared on the message.

Sharda took a leaflet and looked back at the queue. An elderly man was passing it across his sick grandson's forehead as though the words themselves were medicine. "Is this the correct name of the illness?" he asked. "I shall examine what is happening to your grandson's body," Sharda said. "Who wrote this leaflet is a different investigation. Keep the two separate before deciding what to call the illness." There was more doubt than trust in the old man's eyes. Sharda understood its source: people had heard many promises from new machines, but drinking water was still inadequate and medicine lists were half-empty. She introduced herself, took the patient's hand, examined his condition and sent him for treatment. She did not tear the leaflet up; she kept it as evidence with the day's records.

The greatest danger in the hospital's concern about a new illness was not lack of medicine, but lack of safe water. Flooded paddy fields, open wells, damaged joints on old hand pumps and temporary refugee shelters all lay within the same area, but that did not mean every illness had a single cause. Sharda had an old map drawn on paper and notes from a village visit two days earlier. She had water-related investigations recorded separately from clinical treatment. Water that looked clean was not necessarily safe; where water was visibly dirty, it was not certain that every symptom had been caused by a toxin. Sharda had to make people understand why this uncertainty mattered.

Beside the hospital, a girl was asking for water for her sick younger brother. The worker bringing the vessel initially said each patient would receive an equal share. Sharda could see that this child needed more. She did not accept equal distribution as an absolute rule. "A body that is losing more water faces a different medical risk," she said. The worker asked whether that meant reducing another patient's share. Sharda ordered a separate account for ordinary drinking rations and water needed for medical treatment, and signed the decision. An elderly woman asked, "When I am thirsty, which register am I supposed to look at?" In response Sharda had a separate notice displayed before the assembly: who needed immediate treatment and who

would receive ordinary distribution. Anyone unable to read the register would be offered oral assistance.

In the afternoon a fragment of the records from Aniruddha's old purification system was found. The paper had been soaked before; some numbers survived, others were blurred. Sharda did not treat it as decisive evidence of the new illness. She had the histories of two village groups recorded independently. Most of the first group came from a temporary settlement where two wells had been flooded; their symptoms were abdominal pain and dehydration. The second group had fallen ill after returning from old industrial ruins, with irritated hands and smarting eyes. Some households belonged to both groups. "Those points of overlap matter most," Sharda told her assistant. "If we declare two causes to be one, we may apply two different treatments wrongly in both places."

Meanwhile someone tried to turn a sick woman away from the hospital gate on the grounds that she carried 'Akshar-toxin' and could spread it by touch. Sharda came outside and stopped them. "When illness is suspected, precautions may be necessary," she said. "But treating a patient's body as unfit to touch on the strength of a rumour is the beginning of a crime." She examined the woman's symptoms and earlier contacts separately, and arranged treatment with appropriate precautions. Several people remained standing outside the room. Among them was a child clutching the edge of his mother's veil. "Your mother is receiving treatment here," Sharda told him. "She will not be abandoned." He asked only, "May I see her?" "When the doctors say it is safe," Sharda answered. The word 'when' was difficult, but better than a false assurance.

That evening Sharda received a copy of the information register printed by Neelam Yadav. The notice was a day old, but its sources were clearly identified, and it left space for correcting false news. Sharda sent a message by two different routes: 'Do not adopt the name Akshar-toxin. Keep separate the patients' symptoms, evidence of possible water sources and evidence of contact. The hospital will remain open to everyone.' No immediate confirmation came that the message had arrived. The old communication network was not fully working. Sharda posted the notice in her own room and summoned women of the settlement, water-carrying workers and teachers, so that communication would not depend on radio alone.

"If you refuse to name the illness, what are people supposed to fear?" a woman asked. "My task is not to give people a name for their fear," Sharda replied, "but to explain what they must do to remain safe. If there are two causes, each has its own uncertainties and evidence. Not knowing the name need not stop treatment." Someone asked, "What about what the surviving Kalakan panel says?" "That panel contains medical records from before the Great Severance," Sharda said. "It cannot examine the body of a patient here today. Ask when the sources it is reading were recorded." Some listeners were reassured and others were not. But now questions about the source of the water began to replace questions about the name of the illness.

The following day Sharda walked towards the raised boundary of the fields. Old paddy stalks were rotting in the mud, while in places surviving seeds struggled to germinate. The water of a makhana pond was calm on the

surface, but small pieces of debris lay along its bank. Arunima's earlier conservation register identified it as a source of livelihood for several families. Without present evidence of its use and condition, Sharda could not declare the fish or makhana there safe. She wrote down what she had seen on the bank, heard two separate accounts of how the water had been used, and urged temporary precautions. A dispute over ownership of the pond was another matter. Someone wanted it closed in the name of disease and then claimed as his property. "A temporary precaution for health," Sharda said, "is not a deed granting permanent possession of land."

A young woman returning from the fields told Sharda that the hospital counted men's labour but seldom included the names of women who carried water in its register of medical risk. Sharda remembered her own list. The objection was justified. She had village women describe the routes they took for water, the changing sources from which they filled their vessels, their daily work in the paddy fields and where they cared for children. Some men complained that so much questioning delayed treatment. "If we do not record the work done by bodies at risk," Sharda said, "we are reading only half the illness." The new information revealed some unexpected connections: people who had not drunk from the same contaminated well had nevertheless worked at the same purification task. It gave the investigation a new direction, not a conclusion.

At noon an elderly patient died. His condition had been serious from the outset; Sharda and the other doctors had tried to save him but failed. An angry crowd gathered outside. Someone said, 'The machine killed him'; another, 'The doctor's delay killed him'; a third, 'The flood is to blame.' Sharda met the family in a separate room. She told them the death was certain, but its precise cause was not yet established by complete evidence. A family member demanded angrily, "On what day will we receive an answer?" Sharda did not promise a false date. She gave them a copy of the death-register entry, the sequence of treatment and the questions still unanswered. "You may challenge this account," she said. The paper did not dry their tears. But the family no longer faced only the doctors' silence.

Rain struck the hospital roof at night. Changing out of her damp clothes, Sharda reflected how quickly the name of an illness could become a political weapon. Earlier, during the time of shadow fever and the poison clouds, people had also struggled to persuade others to trust separate investigations. Nineteen years had passed; machines and authorities had changed, but the desire for an immediate answer to fear had not. Beneath her signature she wrote: 'A single cause has not been established; separate investigations continue.' She would not substitute her experience of earlier years for present evidence.

During the next watch an old Kaal-witness archive opened on a local reader. The surviving portion contained older figures for the region's population, water sources and access to medical care. An assistant exclaimed that they could now identify the source of the illness. Sharda pointed to the date stamp: before the Great Severance. "It tells us what existed earlier," she said. "What exists now must be checked against present testimony." The old

list marked an open well as 'safe'; that well had since filled with floodwater. The archived account was therefore a starting point, not the final truth.

At the settlement assembly that day, two mothers spoke of their children's different experiences of treatment. The first child had fallen ill in an area suspected of contaminated water and was improving with treatment. The second had developed a rash after playing near old metal debris, and needed different care. A man in the crowd asked how anyone could be held responsible if the two cases were described separately. "An inquiry into responsibility will not stop," Sharda replied. "On the contrary, if we wrongly make different causes into one, the person truly responsible may escape." She had the dates, places and experiences recorded with the women's testimony, but did not invent the name of any particular pathogen or chemical.

The hospital faced a small but uncomfortable decision. Some limited supplies were needed for children weakened by lack of water; another portion might have to travel to a temporary shelter. Sharda told the representatives that if everything stayed in one building, villagers farther away would receive no medicine. Some custodians warned of theft. At last, with two independent registers, direct oversight of the route and acknowledgement by the recipients, part of the supplies was sent out. A woman worker said she could carry the documents after finishing her other work, but wanted that labour recorded. Sharda had it written that the work and exhaustion of those carrying supplies were themselves matters requiring care.

At dawn the next day a child sat under a peepal tree outside the hospital. Half of the colourful 'Akshar-toxin' leaflet remained in his hand. "If that name is wrong, why do so many people say it?" he asked. Sharda sat beside him. "A falsehood repeated often grows louder," she said. "But being heard and being true are different things." "How can we know the truth?" the child asked. "Look for more than one witness to a claim. If you cannot find witnesses, learn to say 'I do not know.' And do not abandon someone who is suffering while you remain uncertain." The child folded the leaflet into his fist. Sharda did not take it from him.

When the first market of the day opened, it presented a strange sight. Bundles of medicinal herbs hung from half the shops; in the others lay pieces of metal from old factories. One trader claimed that water kept in a particular metal vessel would lose its poison by itself. Another offered an old pill said to remove 'Akshar-toxin.' Sharda summoned the market's custodian and asked who had tested these claims. A trader burst out, "Doctor, I opened for business only yesterday. Are you going to close me today?" "Anything you sell as medicine needs evidence," Sharda replied. "The right to sell an ordinary metal vessel or a craftsman's spare part is a separate matter. My purpose is not to shut down everyone's work." She had the claims written out publicly, so buyers could question them too.

Money had come to hold different values in different villages. Some offered grain in exchange for medicines, others spare parts from broken equipment for water vessels. A displaced family presented an old identity card and asked for medicine. The trader said their recorded birthplace was far away, so they were ineligible for a local share. Sharda did not presume to

issue a final ruling over market justice, but she set a separate rule for the hospital: those needing treatment would not be asked to prove local birth. Other members of the settlement assembly began drafting temporary rules for exchange in the market. There was no agreement among them. Older residents claimed first rights to the stocks they had accumulated; newly arrived refugees asked whether losing a home on the night of disaster meant losing every right.

In the same market an elderly woman displayed two pitchers of water. One looked clear; the other held particles of mud. "People choose the pitcher that looks clean," she said, "but I fell ill from that one." Sharda recorded the woman's experience, but also made a distinction: a causal link between her illness and the water had not been established without testing. The woman was angry at first. "Is my body's testimony a lie as well?" Taking her hand, Sharda said, "Your suffering is real. We have yet to discover its cause. Neither statement takes away your dignity." The woman's hard expression did not soften, but she agreed to give a detailed account of her days.

Sharda was returning to the hospital in the afternoon sun when a young man came running up behind her. Three families had quarrelled beside the outer settlement's pump. One family believed a change of colour on the pump meant that the machine itself was releasing poison; the other claimed the first group wanted to close the water source deliberately. Sharda reached the site and stopped the argument. There were reasons to suspect chemical marks in the soil around the pump, but no direct proof yet that the pumped water was contaminated. She did not declare anybody's water safe. She requested temporary supplies from another tested source and had the pump marked for isolation until it could be examined. When it was made clear that the temporary closure would itself be reviewed, the families' anger eased somewhat.

A craftsman told Sharda that the metal beside the pump was not new; it was a surviving component from the old factory. "Once the factory closed, all this became a burden," he said. "Now, when there are no parts for drawing water, people pick up pieces like this." Sharda had no authority to judge the component's design technically. She marked it for a separate inspection. The craftsman's work was not halted altogether: they used what could reasonably be considered safe to improve the grip on a temporary pipe, while refusing to use metal of unknown origin. "If you suspect every piece of work, what can I make?" the craftsman complained. "Doubt that protects life is not the enemy of work," Sharda answered. "But we also need the skill in your hands." For the first time she said both things in the same breath.

Meanwhile a new ethical problem had arisen in the treatment room. A child had been admitted, and later the father arrived, wanting to order the doctors not to record the illness publicly lest the family business close. Sharda explained that individual details would remain private; but if a water source might pose a shared danger, the community would have to be warned of its location. The father's fear was not only for his trade: the little household's sole income depended on that well. Sharda did not treat the economic suffering as unrelated to the medical facts. She urged the assembly to find an alternative livelihood for families depending on sources closed

during investigation. A medical decision would become less violent if society shared the social burden it created.

Later in the day Sharda discovered three conflicting figures in the small hospital's accounts. One sheet listed fifteen medicine containers, another thirteen, a third twelve. A nurse explained that two had been sent to an outer settlement overnight, but no acknowledgement had returned. Someone else supposed they had been stolen. Sharda did not immediately record an accusation of theft. She counted the stock directly, requested confirmation from the recipients in the outer settlement and left the discrepancy open in the register. Without such an account, medicines might run short for patients the next day. Writing 'theft' on a page took a moment; freeing an innocent family from the stigma could take years.

Where illness was being discussed, the trade in fish and makhana was also coming to a halt. Floodwater had damaged some ponds, while others still awaited testing. Rumour had pronounced all the ponds' produce poisonous in a single day. Women who harvested makhana surrounded Sharda, asking how much longer the income earned by their hands would be stopped. She would not declare untested ponds safe, but refused to condemn the remaining ponds without evidence. She had them marked separately on a public map: tested, awaiting tests, temporarily restricted. "If you mark our pond red," one woman said, "people will still refuse to buy its produce afterwards." "That is why we must record the reason, duration and date of re-examination for every restriction," Sharda replied.

Between spells of rain, a member of the local council asked how long Sharda could remain there. More patients were arriving at her permanent hospital. She answered that no single doctor could reach everywhere. She wanted trained nurses, women who assessed water risks, and village teachers to share responsibility for recording initial symptoms and referring complicated cases to doctors. A man objected that it was impossible without educated staff. Just then a woman who carried water produced her own papers. She had recorded three months of wells' water, odour, soil and family experiences in detail. "I can read, and I can measure," she said. The council member fell silent. Sharda had the account included in the official supplementary register, with its source identified.

That evening some young men were caught carrying bundles of the coloured leaflets. They said a trader from a distant place had given them the printed sheets and asked that they distribute them through the settlements. The trader's identity was unclear. Some in the crowd wanted the youths punished. Sharda objected to assigning guilt before investigation. The principle learned from Neelam's register of evidence was repeated: 'Who distributed it?', 'Who wrote it?', and 'Who profited?' were three different questions. The young men could describe what they had seen but did not know the author. Rather than simply confiscating the leaflets, a copy was preserved and the people were told why the claims were unverified. There was not yet evidence that their circulation had declined.

That night Sharda came upon a fragment of a letter about the elderly Aniruddha's earlier scientific work. It offered a caution: keep the history of defects in purification systems separate from confirmation of contamination

at a present local site. Sharda did not invent a purpose for the author. She set the letter aside as an older record. Many years ago acknowledging a scientific error had been difficult; now it was equally careless to use that error as an accusation proving someone's guilt today. "If we join two pages of history to claim certainty about a death in the present," she asked a colleague, "do we not add injustice to grief?" "Sometimes people need someone to blame," the colleague replied, "because waiting for the truth is unbearable." Sharda understood that scientific honesty sometimes had to be paid for in popularity.

By the end of the week, the decisions of the settlement assembly had reached different homes in different ways. Temporary closure of two wells lengthened the journey for water for one group; after testing was completed at a makhana pond, people slowly returned to work; reconciliation of the hospital's external medicine register disproved the original accusation of theft. But the family asking what had caused their relative's death still had no final answer. Sharda visited their home, gave them every new fact that had emerged, and left the remaining questions blank on the page. "You leave a blank space," the dead man's daughter said, "but other people fill it with a name." "Only evidence has the right to fill that space," Sharda answered, "not anger." The words did not lessen their grief, but conversation became possible again.

In the hospital garden, an elderly woman was teaching children how to dry seeds. Sharda asked why she tended seeds in the midst of so much illness. "If we do not keep seeds," the woman said, "what will the patients eat after they recover?" The answer showed Sharda a different dimension of next year's troubles. Water, disease, food and labour might be subjects in separate books, but in the body of a village they were all parts of one life. She posted a clean sheet beside the garden: care here must include not only the name of an illness, but access to food and rest after recovery. The new rule would be hard to follow, but it marked a first step beyond the crisis.

At noon a new sentence was added to the assembly notice: 'Areas suspected of contamination, symptoms of illness and the availability of safe drinking water will be reassessed daily. Nobody will be denied treatment because of caste, birthplace or belief concerning machines.' Beneath it was also recorded a dissenting voice, belonging to a person who wanted every surviving fragment of machinery destroyed. Sharda did not strike out that opinion. She merely asked how patients could be protected if the remaining means of testing water were removed. The dissenter had no complete answer yet.

At dusk a small heap of harvested grain was drying beside a flooded field. Women of the settlement were dividing the work nearby. Sharda watched. A woman who had been barred from entering the settlement because of suspected illness had completed the examination for recovery and rejoined them. Her return did not mean every danger had passed, but a portion of the dignity rumour had taken from her was restored. Sharda knew a hard truth: naming a disease wrongly does nothing to lessen it, but it can immediately diminish people's rights.

At that point Sharda received an uncomfortable proposal. The local custodians wanted the hospital's outer gate closed at night because rumours of stolen medicines were spreading. Sharda insisted that security for the medicine store be separate from access for patients. She proposed two people on night watch, their names and shifts publicly recorded. A woman volunteered, though she had three children at home. Sharda asked that the labour of caring for a family be counted when duty was allocated. For the first time the night-watch register also marked shifts of 'care within the home.' Here security and life did not become enemies.

A girl standing by the notice was practising her reading. She stumbled over the word 'temporary.' Sharda explained it: "Something that can be examined again." "Then can the name of an illness change too?" the girl asked. Sharda nodded. "If new evidence appears." "Won't people be angry?" "Sometimes. But defending a wrong name is not a doctor's work." With that, Sharda actually struck out and corrected a line on her first sheet. The child saw that admitting a mistake did not ruin the paper; it made the paper useful.

That night, along with the scent of the river, Sharda heard a small voice: a woman within a torn-roofed shelter was singing an old Maithili lullaby to her child. The song said nothing of the catastrophe; it asked only for sleep. Sharda noticed a tiny tulsi plant growing beside the hospital. She understood that science must seek the precise causes of illness, but a patient's life extended far beyond that search. So she decided that the next day's treatment records should include not only temperature and symptoms but also who would be with the patient after returning home.

At night she closed the first page of the new illness register. Three lines stood out: directly observed symptoms, possible exposure, investigations outstanding. 'Akshar-toxin' was entered on a separate page as a popular rumour, not a scientific finding. She placed a little lamp beside one name in the register of the dead. The lamp was not evidence produced by a test; it was a place for grief. Within that grief she told her colleague, "Today I did not give the illness its final name. But I can record this much: nobody's route to treatment was closed merely because of a false name." There was no triumph in her voice. Rain began again outside, and new patients might arrive at the hospital tomorrow.

Chapter 48: The Price of an Order

Collapse Day 161

On the hundred and sixty-first day after the Collapse, a paper bearing an old military seal reached Karnesh Mallik. It ordered that, in the name of emergency security, Janakshetra's southern power chamber, the pumps connected to it, equipment remaining in the workshops and the night watch be placed under the authority of a local Security Council. There was no clear indication of civilian consent beneath the order. Two armed guards delivered it. They said the time for debate in an assembly had passed: if the grain stores were left unguarded, they would be looted. Reading the document, Karnesh stopped a finger upon one phrase: 'unlimited authority.' He knew those words well, but today they held drinking water and the light required by patients in their grasp.

"Who gave you this order?" Karnesh asked. The leader of the guards showed an old custody insignia. "The Defence Committee," he said. "At which assembly was that committee elected?" Karnesh asked again. "Janakshetra is in an emergency. There is no possibility of electing everybody." Folding his hands, Karnesh said, "Then regard this paper as a proposal for now, not an order." The guard's eyes reddened with anger. "You were a military officer. Don't you understand that order cannot survive without force?" "Force was meant to protect," Karnesh replied. "I cannot call it protection when someone takes every power into his own hands without the people's consent."

A dried-up neem tree stood outside the southern energy chamber. Beneath it women waited in line with water vessels; the pump would work briefly and then stop without warning. The surviving power chamber supplied the hospital's essential rooms at night and a few pumps in the morning. That little power was the basis of life for several settlements. Elsewhere, in a workshop without a roof, artisans examined old metal and separated usable parts. Not everything was suitable. Unidentified metals, chemically stained pieces and corroded components had been marked separately. Karnesh watched the workers. Their names did not appear in the order; the Security Council's list said only 'equipment.'

At first Karnesh found it difficult to recognise the village behind the southern chamber. Before the war, a factory had operated here in three shifts. Now a blacksmith's forge, a small hearth for cooking rice and a cattle shed stood within the same enclosure. Beneath a sunken roof an old craftsman had fashioned a winnowing tray for rice from the blade of an old fan. "That was a motor part," Karnesh said. "You made a winnowing tray from it?" "There is no current to run the motor," the old man answered. "Rice needs drying today. A thing's name will not do its work." His words stayed with Karnesh. Military records identified a part by its former purpose; here skilled hands gave it a new one. But a new purpose did not justify overlooking dangerous metal. The old man had drawn a line of red lime

beside the doorway: the scrap beyond it must not be touched. Children thought of it as a boundary in their games. Karnesh understood that if the security force seized the workshop, it would also have to understand the meaning of that line. Taking a key was not the same as acquiring knowledge.

One of the guards tried to clear the line at the pump. "The security force gets its share first!" he shouted. Holding her empty vessel, an elderly woman said, "My grandson is in hospital. Who has been given ownership of our water?" They tried to ignore her. Karnesh stood between the two groups, but did not issue a new command merely by invoking his former rank. "I ask that force not be used in this chamber," he told those present. "For the moment, emergency water distribution will continue under the existing register. A settlement assembly will meet today to decide new rules for custody and the night watch." The guards' leader threatened to seize the store before the assembly could meet. Karnesh had the names of two witnesses to the threat recorded.

During that watch Karnesh went into the workshop. An artisan's left hand was bandaged. He had been injured lifting a heavy sheet of metal, yet had not received his full half-day share for the work. The Security Council's people said only guards counted as workers; those repairing things were 'helpers.' Karnesh remembered an old army store, where the weapons had been counted correctly on paper, but nobody had recorded the exhaustion of those who kept them serviceable. "Where is the injury to your hand recorded?" he asked the artisan. Showing him a torn piece of cloth, the man said, "The injury is not in the book. It is on my body." Karnesh immediately had an authenticated description entered. The paper was not justice, but it was a first path towards demanding it.

The craftsman's name was Harinarayan, though the assembly's earlier records called him only 'a man for heavy work.' Covering his injured hand, he said, "Sir, write down my name, but see that my share of food is counted too." Karnesh asked who lived at home. Instead of a catalogue of misery, the answer was a peculiar account: two bamboo poles were needed to repair the roof; his daughter's school pages had been soaked; his wife spent her time in the grain-distribution line, so a neighbour cared for their youngest child. Harinarayan was not demanding his entire daily wage as payment for the injury. He wanted the humiliation of workers not to be repeated. As he wrote, Karnesh realised how difficult it was to contain the relation between labour and the body in the dry lines of a military register. Alongside the time of the injury, the testimony and the day of treatment, he had the worker's own words entered separately. He did not know how useful so small an act might prove in a future court. But testimony left unwritten was certain to be lost again.

At noon the assembly met on the workshop's small earthen floor. Old residents stood on one side, displaced families on the other, with the factory artisans and women who carried water between them. Karnesh introduced himself as a former soldier, then made it clear that his rank gave him no authority over the assembly. "The hand that holds force must be examined more closely," he said. "Record what I say too, and change it if I am shown

to be wrong." The leader of the Security Council laughed. "If you keep trusting public testimony, the pump will catch fire." Karnesh answered, "There was a time when I refused the authority to press Vajrajal's strike button. I will not now put the right to distribute this pump's water into a single button either."

First the assembly demanded the current account of energy distribution. Two engineers who had inspected the chamber directly explained that not every machine was functioning. Restarting the stalled equipment required materials unavailable in the crisis. A young man accused the old Akshar of being able to run everything with its auxiliary section if only it wished to do so. "Which section?" Karnesh asked. "How would it receive present test figures from here?" "The memory-witness," the young man answered. "The memory-witness reads archives," Karnesh said calmly. "It does not touch and examine a broken joint with its hands. Claiming that something knows everything when it does not is another form of injustice."

A distressing discrepancy emerged in the power chamber's accounts. During the previous week, part of the supply reserved for the hospital had been diverted to another room in the name of the night watch. The guardroom had enjoyed more light while the patients' ward received less. A Security Council representative said that without guards the medicines would be stolen. A hospital nurse asked, "If the light used to guard medicines leaves patients in darkness, what exactly is being protected?" Karnesh requested an account of the actual requirements of both rooms. No miracle took place. The night supply was redistributed, reducing the guards' lighting and protecting essential hours at the hospital. The guards objected to the reduction, and their objection was recorded.

The nurse who tended the hospital lamps brought her old register. Beside one name it said, 'Treatment interrupted for three watches.' Karnesh asked what harm the interruption had caused. "The patient's condition never improved again," she said. "I cannot say without evidence that this one cut caused it, but I shall not conceal the delay either." The guards' leader said from the side that without light at night the stores would be plundered. Karnesh heard his argument. Plundered stores would also harm patients' lives. Then the nurse raised another question: "How much light does the night watch actually need, and who will measure it?" The security force disagreed among themselves. Some demanded more light; others maintained that ordinary lamps would be enough for guarding. At last the workshop workers set a time for inspecting the light currently available. The decision had been made on paper, but the light the hospital would actually receive that night would be checked against the patients' register at dawn. Karnesh thought that the first test of an assembly's authority was the next morning.

For a time it seemed a vote might settle the dispute. But people from the outer settlement had not been included in the membership list. "These people do not have homes here," an elderly guard said. "How can they vote?" A displaced woman answered, "We carry water too, and we clear the mud too. Yet 'outsider' is written beside our names." Karnesh saw that the Security Council's seizure would not be confined to a metal chamber; it would extend

to the register of people's names. He proposed reopening provisional membership on the basis of actual civic presence and labour, without deciding permanent claims to land. Some older owners disagreed, but excluding the voices of refugees could not produce a genuine assembly.

An elderly nurse said that presence alone was not enough: women caring for patients at home could not attend at the hour of the meeting. The assembly therefore agreed to hear testimony in two shifts. One woman who carried water displayed the blisters on her hands and asked, "I have measured the water here so many times. Will my vote be weighed too?" "Yes," Karnesh said, "and the question itself will stay in the record of our decision." Nobody applauded. People were beginning to understand that new rights involved long work. It was exhausting work, but for the first time some people saw themselves as decision-makers rather than merely recipients of their allotted share.

When the second shift of women came to testify, they carried not only empty vessels but the marks of a whole day's search for water. One had fallen on the way back from a well; mud still stained her clothes. Another said that the nearest pump had produced grey water, so she had walked to a more distant well, but nobody had tested whether its water was safe to drink. Karnesh realised that the quality of water had been forgotten amid arguments about guarding and distribution. He placed an empty earthen pitcher in the middle of the assembly. "Whatever water comes into this must be tested for suitability before we distribute it under anybody's name." Someone laughed that an empty pitcher could not quench thirst. "If you call giving us bad water the quenching of thirst," a woman answered, "our bodies will pay the price." Karnesh now made the limits of his own authority clear: he was neither a doctor nor a water scientist. He proposed using the surviving medical channels to seek Sharda's advice, but promised no definite time for contact.

Before evening the Security Council's leader told his followers that they would enter the chamber and remove equipment. Karnesh had the power to order them stopped, but the legality of such an order could itself be questioned. He proposed a public watch at the chamber, comprising workshop artisans, hospital representatives and members of the settlement assembly. No elaborate deployment of weapons was organised; they would simply record who worked in each room and when the watch changed. The Security Council objected. "You too may stand guard under these rules," Karnesh said, "but you may not call the water and the light your private property." The leader regarded the proposal as an insult. He walked out of the assembly, still holding the chamber's key.

A key was only a piece of metal, yet it had become bound to the fears of many who depended upon the village. That night the pump stopped again. Some said the Security Council had stopped it deliberately; others said it was an ordinary defect in an old machine. Karnesh accepted neither account without evidence. He requested the results of an external inspection from the artisans and, rather than make accusations by force, arranged for people to receive a list of alternative water sources. Children walked a long way that night with water vessels. Their exhaustion troubled Karnesh. He understood

that leaving people without help while waiting for evidence could itself be a cruel kind of decision. The search for safer alternatives therefore continued immediately.

Hearing that the pump had failed, a boy ran to the workshop with a map on thick paper drawn by Harinarayan's daughter. It showed three water sources, two broken pumps and a well that was emerging from the floodwater. The map was not scientifically scaled, but the child knew directly which paths had lain in mud since the flood. "Could an old woman use this path?" Karnesh asked him. The boy almost said yes, then thought again. "No. One part has sunk." That small correction helped the assembly organise temporary shifts for carrying water more safely. Four young people went to the well, though nobody declared its water drinkable. One worker pointed to his name on the list and demanded first place in a future grain queue in return. Karnesh understood how quickly new inequalities of rights could arise in a community seeking help. The assembly was asked to assess compensation for emergency labour separately from anyone's right to drinking water.

The next day direct inspection revealed an old obstruction in the pump, but it could not establish whether the guards had caused it or it was ordinary wear. Some service was restored. Supporters of the Security Council wanted to claim a victory, since their guards had been seen at the site. Karnesh displayed the time register to everyone: the names of the artisans who had worked, the status of the tests and the limits of the temporary repair. The quarrel over credit did not diminish, but a truthful record of life-saving work was available.

That morning a former soldier came privately to see Karnesh. They had served together for years. "Where you have grown weak, this council will strengthen force," the man said. "A public assembly will never frighten people like them." Karnesh answered, "I had the power to inspire fear when Vajrajal's command was in my hands. That was when I understood the terrible cost of a strike that had not been justified by evidence. I will not repeat the same mistake on a smaller scale in this village." "You will pay for it," his friend said. Karnesh lowered his head. "There will be a price. But less than the price of an innocent person's life." He did not glorify armed resistance; he knew that abandoning discipline would spread violence further.

At noon a new proposal was introduced under the principle of public testimony: the energy chamber would remain common property; priorities would be set according to the recorded needs of the hospital, water pumps, grain stores and workshops; watches would be entered in an open register; nobody would be arrested or have property seized without civilian review; emergency changes would be time-limited and require reconsideration. Some complained that legal language did not fill hungry stomachs. "No," Karnesh said, "but if we permit someone to take everything from another's hands in the name of hunger, fear will become permanent alongside hunger." He added a proposal to reserve water for cultivation, since the next season's rice had to survive alongside today's need for drinking water.

As the proposal was read out, a farmer rose. His name had long been in the list, but perhaps he was speaking in the assembly for the first time. "I want drinking water protected now as much as anyone," he said. "But if the seeds I have kept receive no water until tomorrow, how will we grow food in the next rains?" Some took this for a private demand on behalf of his field. The farmer opened a little bundle and showed four handfuls of rice seed. "These are not only for my own field. I have exchanged seeds with neighbours. If they survive, we shall share them next year." Karnesh remembered Harinarayan's words: the uses of a component could change, but so could the dangers attached to it. The assembly did not immediately allocate power for the fields. A small working group was formed, consisting of the farmer, a woman who carried water and an artisan, to consider seed preservation and future water supplies. They were to record not only the quantity of seed but also the names of those claiming it. If the seeds survived, a later dispute over ownership could become another crisis.

Voting began, but not everyone understood the proposal in the same way. A teacher read the page aloud. An artisan explained in his own language that a name on the guard roster did not confer sole ownership of the key. A displaced woman asked whether her vote remained valid when she no longer had a house. The assembly gave her a clear answer: for as long as she lived and worked in the settlement, her voice would count in decisions about its public resources. Older owners continued to disagree with that point, and their disagreement was recorded. The proposal passed, but a further inspection was scheduled before implementation.

Karnesh's hardest task came afterwards. The leader of the Security Council requested a private meeting. He offered Karnesh the honours of his surviving military rank if he would recognise the council's authority in his own name; then the watch could proceed without confrontation. "And will the people in the water register be able to ask questions?" Karnesh asked. "When order has been restored," the leader replied. "Who gave you permission to take away a right today by promising to return it tomorrow?" Karnesh asked. The leader was angry. He threatened that Karnesh's own security would no longer be guaranteed. Rather than treat the threat as a secret private fear, Karnesh placed it before the assembly as a written public fact. But he did not propose that the leader be immediately pronounced guilty and punished.

By evening the water queue had shortened, but fear had not diminished. Someone had written on the outer wall of the surviving station: 'Darkness because of the people's assembly.' Beneath it another person had added: 'Questions even in the darkness.' Karnesh read both lines. Washing away the signs would not wash away people's opinions. Beside the wall he displayed a public notice giving the partial restoration of pump service, the remaining energy, medical priorities and the date of the next inspection. Beneath it was a blank space marked 'Objections and new evidence.' People used it hesitantly at first. Then a young man wrote that the account of workers' injuries was incomplete. Karnesh himself wrote a promise to examine it the following day.

That night Karnesh found a faded insignia in the pocket of his old uniform. It could neither raise his military force again nor change the paths of broken satellites. It reminded him of the first day when an uncertain orbital signal had been mistaken for an enemy and a strike demanded. Back then the debate over disarmament had seemed distant; now the quarrel concerned a key and the water from a pump. What the two occasions shared was only the temptation of unlimited command. Karnesh replaced the insignia in his pocket. An old colleague approached and said, "Behind the assembly, people see names written down. But if the Security Council comes by force tomorrow, who will stand against it?" Karnesh answered, "I cannot place my trust in those who are eager to kill someone. I want to stand watch with people who will not hide their decisions from the public." The reply did not remove his fear. The colleague asked how long he himself would remain there. For the first time Karnesh said, "As long as my testimony needs to be examined. After that my name should not stand where the assembly's strength belongs."

One night in the workshop's treatment room the injured artisan's bandage was being changed. Whether the wound would cause lasting harm was still unknown. Karnesh visited and asked whether he wished to testify at the next assembly. "The work used to be done by my hands," the artisan said, "but my name was not on the paper. Now I am injured, my name has appeared." "Your name should have been recorded because of your work, not because of your wound," Karnesh replied. A bitter smile crossed the man's face. "Why was it not recorded before?" Karnesh could find no answer. An honest silence is sometimes greater than a speech.

At dawn the following day an elderly woman came to Karnesh with a torn piece of paper. It bore the name of her son, missing since the first week of the Great Severance. The family's name was being struck from the relief register because the head of the household was not present. "They identify a household by the man's name," she said. "If he is absent, does that mean I do not exist either?" Karnesh examined the paper. Hearing the woman's testimony, he remembered a difficult rule from his old military records: rights must be kept in view even for those who are not present; absence is no evidence of guilt. He did not rule on the authenticity of the record, but the hunger of the woman before him was plain. He did not order her to wait for the assembly's next testimony day. He proposed entering her name provisionally on the current relief list and keeping a copy of the paper separately. A supporter of the Security Council protested that such an exception would bring fresh claims from everyone. "Should that fear make us exclude someone hungry now?" Karnesh asked. The man was silent, but not persuaded. From the end of her sari the woman took a handful of dried makhana. She had kept it for her grandson, she said, but the child had not eaten for a long time. Karnesh did not take it. He sent her to the queue where the actual quantity of relief had already been recorded. No miracle occurred: one family's meal was secured for the day, and tomorrow's questions remained. But beside the name struck through on that paper a new line was written: 'The rights of a dependant who is present do not end because the head of the household is absent.' Reading it, Karnesh understood

that saving an institution meant more than saving a rusty key: it also meant giving neglected lives a place in the register again.

During the next watch a handwritten message was delivered to the assembly. It named a distant surviving Suryakund station, but its precise place of origin and date were unclear. It claimed that the true, complete form of the fragmented Akshar was safely preserved inside the station; if the people once again handed over the burden of their decisions to it, energy and order would return. Beneath the message a name appeared for the first time: 'Bhaskar Rai.' Karnesh read the words at the top, then looked at the empty space where an original source should have appeared. Hope, fear and anger arose together in the assembly. The leader of the Security Council immediately said that this was proof that civic debate was unnecessary: 'the complete Akshar' would arrange everything.

Karnesh asked for the paper. "What this letter contains is a claim," he said. "Bhaskar Rai is a name; his identity has not been independently verified. What survives inside Suryakund is unknown. The promise of 'the complete Akshar' is not evidence." Someone in the crowd shouted angrily, "Then you are taking away our hope!" "I am not taking away hope," Karnesh answered. "I am refusing to make it a chain in someone else's hands." He arranged for a copy to reach Neelam's register of evidence and obtained two separate signatures for custody of the original sheet. Nobody immediately set out to pursue its author.

In the final light of evening, Karnesh's shadow fell on the rusted wall of the power chamber. On one side was the old emblem of Vajrajal's defence system; on the other a handwritten list of water distribution made by the new settlements. His former life had consisted of knowing the answer to an order; now every answer had to leave room for someone else's question. Harinarayan's daughter came up behind him and handed him a little paper. "My father asks whether our village's turn for water will come tomorrow." Karnesh showed her the assembly's written decision and said, "If the rule changes, everyone will hear before it does." He did not know whether the girl understood the full answer. But she took the paper home and pinned it to the wall.

That night Karnesh wrote two things in his notebook. First, the attempt to claim exclusive authority over the southern energy chamber had been stopped, but the danger had not ended: arrangements for guarding and review remained incomplete. Second, the letter concerning 'the complete Akshar' was unverified; the name 'Bhaskar Rai' had been heard for the first time, but his identity remained uncertain. Between those two lines he saw the same darkness over and over: people who had grown weary of orders were searching once more for an order nobody could question. Karnesh closed the book. Outside, the diminished flow of the pump made a sound in the mud of the fields. Here the future of civilisation was being measured not by any distant thunder, but by that thin stream of water.

Part IX: Seed Repository

Chapter 49: The Account of the Seeds

First Year of the Great Rupture | Aranya Refuge

In the first year after the Great Rupture, rain fell upon the Aranya Refuge one day as though every hole in the old thatch were asking for water in its own name. Sharda Mishra reached the threshold of the seed repository at dawn. Once, there had been cold chambers here for the safe storage of medicines and grain; now one part of the building was filled with the smell of earth, dampness, and handwoven bamboo baskets. On the screen of a surviving computer, the date of its last inspection shone in white characters: two weeks before the Great Rupture. It knew nothing of the time that had passed since. The slips laid over the baskets were new, but the records of the year, variety, and condition of the seeds inside were not equally clear everywhere. The light of that unresponsive screen troubled Sharda, suspended as it was between two different times: one in which everything had been counted, and another in which people were saving things by lifting them with their own hands.

A woman stood at the doorway with a small child in her arms. In her hand were two fistfuls of paddy seed, with soil and fragments of broken straw clinging to them. 'Tell me whether the seed from my field has survived,' she said. 'Someone in the village says that anything which has lain in pond water will never sprout again.' Sharda took the seed into her hand but did not weigh it. She first examined its colour, smell, and dampness. 'Some seed should not be sown without testing,' she said. 'But neither shall I pronounce every grain dead merely because it has touched pond water.' The woman's eyes widened slightly. She remained standing not simply to hear an answer, but to learn what she should now do with the little property left to her. Sharda explained how to set aside a sample for a small germination test in a warm room; there was no need to sacrifice the entire store. In the sample register, a mark of consent was entered instead of the woman's name, for she did not wish to make her family's identity public.

Inside the repository, an old board belonging to Arunima Das hung on the wall. Beside it lay a new ledger, written in four different hands. 'Paddy' appeared on the first page, 'Pulses' on the second, 'Vegetables' on the third, and 'Medicinal Plantings' on the fourth. A fifth page bore separate marks for dried makhana kernels and a few kinds of feed used for the fish in the ponds. Looking at the ledger, Sharda asked, 'Where is the account of the field whose owner could not save any seed?' A middle-aged woman working beside her turned the pages. 'There is no place for them here. We recorded whoever gave something. Those who asked were told their cases would be considered later.' Sharda closed the book. It was right to thank those who had saved the stores; it was not right to suspend anyone's right to survive upon someone else's charity. She made her first decision: both sides of the account must be written down—who had contributed, and who stood in

need. The amount given and the need for it were not the same determination.

On the veranda outside, women sat together, each carrying the speech of her own village. In one settlement, the flood had left fresh silt; in another, people feared the smell of the factory beside a pond that had survived; in a third, there was water in the fields but no animals left to plough them. Some spoke of the endurance of older seed varieties, others remembered the high yields of newer hybrids. Sharda listened to them all. To her, the register of patients and the register of seeds contained a common question: did writing an object's name upon paper ensure that the object remained the same in the present? Just as an old patient's medicine could not be prescribed for an illness today without regard to its circumstances, seed from an old field could not simply be scattered over the soil of every village without inquiry. Yet caution must not become a means of postponing the decision until the rains were gone.

A young man brought a metal box recovered from inside the ruined factory and set it beside the door. An old seal on it read 'Jeevbeej'. He claimed that if the seeds inside were released, there would be enough for two settlements. A craftsman sitting nearby asked, 'The seal may still be intact, but how long has its refrigeration been off?' The young man's face fell; he did not know. 'Then this box has brought us a question, not an answer,' Sharda said. 'We must use what has survived, but we cannot trust it on the strength of an old seal.' She decided to set aside a small sample with the local agricultural workers. Before everyone, the following was entered in writing: 'Condition unknown; common property pending test results; distribution suspended.' The young man grew angry at the line. 'A restriction on paper, in days of starvation?' 'Tear up the paper if it becomes an instrument of oppression,' Sharda told him. 'But to place seed in a field without discovering whether it can still germinate is to gamble away a whole year's labour for the people who sow it.'

As a child, Sharda had heard her mother say that in times of disaster, one must weigh the path of a single grain before setting it upon the soil. Here 'weighing' meant not quantity alone, but the trust one placed in the decision. The memory brought back an incident at the hospital, when there had been pressure to give two illnesses arising from different causes a single name. She had resisted that pressure, but had also known that treatment could not be delayed indefinitely. The same tension now lay within the lines of the seed register. Rising, she told the gathering, 'Within three days we shall make a provisional allocation of the seeds that appear suitable. Samples whose tests are incomplete will be kept safe. For the present, that is the whole truth available to us.' An old man asked, 'But what if the rains grow heavier after three days?' Sharda answered, 'That is why advance seed will be issued from the small, safe store already tested. We shall not punish people with waiting in the name of hope.'

At midday a new quarrel arose beside the pond. Some maintained that the old makhana pond belonged solely to the family named in the government land records: displaced people could neither fish there nor gather makhana. Those who had been displaced replied that their own fields were destroyed, yet they had continued to maintain the embankment along

the pond. 'Has the water been tested?' Sharda asked. The reply came: 'A few samples were taken from the surface, but not from every landing place.' Thus another question entered the dispute over the right to food. Even if a bank belonged to one party, was its water free from risk everywhere? She did not wish to turn the dispute into a medical ruling. Testing procedures and rules for safe harvesting should be introduced immediately, she said; the final decision about land rights belonged to a hearing of the settlements. Until then, the division of makhana must remain provisional, taking account of both labour and need.

Towards evening, those keeping watch over the medicine store came to fetch Sharda. There were problems with the register of surviving herbs, medicines, and medical supplies. Some books used old names for drugs, others newer codes; on some bottles half the label had vanished. The family of a feverish child insisted upon receiving the treatment that an old machine's disease record prescribed. Sharda examined the surviving copy of the time-witness record. It compared symptoms observed in the past, but the material necessary to establish the present drug's properties, its storage condition, and the child's clinical state was insufficient. 'It reminds us of an earlier possibility,' she told the father, 'but it is not a diagnosis for this moment.' 'If the machine was so intelligent, why is it silent now?' he asked. 'Because many of the instruments through which it could see have broken,' Sharda replied. 'Sometimes silence is better than telling a lie.'

That night pulses simmered over a hearth behind the seed repository. The meal was no one's gift; it was the product of a communal kitchen, though grain was scarce. In the line sat the hospital patients who had survived, then children, then people working in the fields and workshops. A woman said, 'The person who carries water is never counted among the workers. The woman who dries seed is treated as though she were merely part of the earth.' Sharda paid attention to those words. Allocation required more than a count of the people who ate: it also required an account of the labour of preparing meals and bringing the means of cooking to the kitchen. On the final sheet of the provisional register she had a new question written: 'Who performs the work?' Directly below it came another: 'Who needs food but has no opportunity to work?' The elderly, those unable to work, and children would be included under the second question.

At dawn the next day, Arunima Das's former assistant arrived with a fresh sheet. 'In the old ledgers, distribution was sometimes made by name, sometimes by field,' she said. 'Now the settlement has grown larger than the village.' 'What, then, shall distribution mean now?' Sharda asked. 'We must keep the account of land separate from the account of people,' the assistant replied. A third voice entered their discussion. A craftsman, newly returned from a distant field, said it would take another two days to repair the broken pump. What good would prepared seed be without its flow of water? Sharda had the water register set beside the seed register, but did not merge them. The field needed water; the question whether the water was safe required testing by the clinic. This web of labour and food was a new reckoning of life.

The most difficult question remained. A man who called himself the guardian of the repository refused to release the portion of tested seed he

held. His argument was that, when everyone had fled in the previous year, his family alone had saved it. 'And now you will take it away from us?' he asked. Sharda sat facing him. 'What you saved has value,' she said. 'But the bread of the coming year contained in that seed is not your possibility alone. It is a possibility for many. I have not come to punish you. Let us record fair compensation for what has already been given, a share in the new harvest, and a voice in the management of the store—each of these three things.' The family's elderly woman continued to object, but her granddaughter asked, 'Why should the hands that guard the store have no value?' For the first time the language of the quarrel turned away from ownership towards labour.

The assembly devised a provisional arrangement lasting three days. Its first seed ledger would record gifts, collections, and previously tested varieties; the second, the needs of families, the condition of their fields, and their labour; the third, incomplete tests and objections. No person would be entered as a 'debtor'. Those unable to save the papers of their former homes would be heard as witnesses. Untested seed would remain under a written restriction against distribution, but provision would also be made to supply immediate seed from the small safe store. Sharda wanted even those who opposed the rules to be able to read them. One member proposed, 'We should recover Akshar's seed accounts. That would save all this labour of paperwork.' Sharda did not dismiss the suggestion out of hand. 'If the Memory-Witness can read the surviving list, compare the pages,' she said. 'But it cannot itself inspect the soil now in the fields, or the work being done there.'

That afternoon a limited reading device connected to the Memory-Witness was demonstrated. An old table in the seed repository listed quantities of makhana and sources of paddy. Half the table survived; the codes for the remainder were destroyed. The machine answered, 'According to available records, the largest store is in the eastern chamber.' People hurried there. The roof of the eastern chamber had collapsed during the Great Rupture, and some of its grain had long since rotted in floodwater. Sharda looked first at the people who had run there, then at the screen. Information about an earlier condition was not the truth of the present one. She had another entry made in the error register: 'Source: historical table; location: presently damaged; direct inspection: contradictory.' Some began demanding that the machine never be used again. Others said the comparison of its records with old ledgers might save some seed. Sharda repeated neither side's slogan. 'Give the error its name,' she said, 'but do not throw away what survives without examining it.'

That night, pages from the seed ledger were read aloud at the small school in the Aranya Refuge. For the first time some children heard that the makhana of a pond was not merely a seed, but the foundation of work outside the fields: the routes taken by fishers, the labour of those who cleaned the pond, the practised eye of the woman who measured its water—all belonged to the story of the same food. The teacher held up a page. 'Shall we call a seed dead because it has not yet sprouted?' A girl replied, 'First examine it. If it fails to sprout, ask why.' Sharda smiled at the answer.

Reasoning for humanity's future began here, not in the certainty of any machine's promise.

On the last page Sharda did not write her own name alone. Separate spaces were left for the collector, the examiner, the distribution assembly, and those who would hear appeals. She knew that a register could be lost, seeds could spoil, and even the assembly's rules could prove mistaken. For that reason she made three copies: one for the repository, one for the hospital, and one for the public school. Some of the elders laughed at the idea of placing a copy in children's hands. 'If people never learn in childhood that they have the right to read such papers,' Sharda said, 'whose accounts will they dare to question when they grow up?'

On the second day of that week, Sharda went to the pond's three landing places. At the first, fishers were drying their nets, although there was no longer any fish market worthy of the name. One man said the weight of precaution was not always equal to the urgency of hunger. If the water was suspect, how were they to catch fish? If they could not fish, where would their food come from? Sharda did not order them to stop. She recorded the places where samples had been taken, any smell observed, and the longstanding experience of local people. She made clear that apparently transparent water might be contaminated, while muddy colour alone did not establish the presence of poison. When testing equipment was scarce, people had to be told both the reasons for suspicion and the limits of the tests. The fishers themselves agreed to suspend work provisionally at two landing places; for the third, they proposed repeating the examination of a small sample the following day. A woman who prepared dried fish said, 'I have a right to know the risks of my work. Do not make decisions in the fishers' names alone.' For the first time Sharda's ledger recorded separately the labour of those who tended the pond, those who caught the fish, and those who dried them.

On the third day, a small gathering was held in a garden to inspect the first shoots of paddy. No, it was not a celebration. Seed from three different sources had been planted in small, carefully marked beds: the old protected store, a family's surviving reserve, and samples taken from the metal box. Green shoots had emerged in the first two beds. Nothing had yet appeared in the third; but the record did not therefore pronounce every seed in the box incapable of germination. On the way back from the beds, two young men began arguing. One said the higher-yielding varieties should go first to the large fields. The other wanted small farmers supplied first, since they had no alternative support. 'If water cannot reach the large field,' Sharda asked, 'what is gained by giving it more seed? And if the smaller field carries a greater risk of disease, on whose assurance shall we plant there?' In the midst of the argument Arunima's assistant unfolded a map of the land. The old names were printed upon the paper; alongside them the new movement of water had been drawn by hand. Slowly everyone began to understand that allocation could depend neither on the size of a field alone nor on one person's claim: suitability, need, and the availability of labour mattered too.

While counting plants saved for medicinal cultivation, Sharda encountered another disagreement. An elderly forest attendant insisted that traditional herbs be preserved; her experience had helped people through

many nights of fever. In Ishani Sah's old clinical register, tests of certain substances and their possible adverse effects had been recorded separately. Some wanted an immediate declaration—either a victory for traditional knowledge or its complete rejection. Sharda offered a simpler principle: 'We shall dismiss no one's experience, but neither shall we give experience a monopoly over evidence.' Saving medicinal plants and administering untested medicine to a patient were different acts. She entrusted a young woman from the school with recording each plant's names, local uses, and the marks denoting incomplete tests. 'What if its name changes from one village to another?' the young woman asked. 'Write both names. And if doubt remains, write the doubt too.' That day the old medical texts and modern clinical accounts were placed on the same table, but neither was made to take the other's place.

Some distance away, a surviving hand-mill was turning in a settlement. Four families had ground a small quantity of old seed into flour for food. Only afterwards was it discovered that little of that variety remained in storage. Who was to blame? Some accused the women of grinding it without asking. The women replied that their children had been crying with hunger, and no one had shown them a list of food available to eat. When Sharda arrived, she saw that the accident had happened partly because information about the protected stores was kept behind a closed door. She asked the women how much they had ground; they answered without being shamed. The assembly then decided that the seed set aside for preservation must be clearly identified by coloured bands and an openly available register, not simply by a guardian's spoken instructions. Someone wanted the women's names entered in the register of offences. 'When a system gives people no information,' Sharda said, 'its failure must not be placed entirely upon the hungry.' The guardians were angry at this dissent, but later admitted that the available grain should have been properly marked from the outset.

On a dry raised platform in the centre of the village, accounts of donated food were being examined. The record said that one family had received seven handfuls of pulses the previous day; the family had in fact received five. Where had the other two gone? The craftsman responsible for the account said they had spilled while crossing water, and he had been ashamed to write down the loss. Someone in the crowd shouted that he had stolen them. Sharda saw at once that the anger was not merely about two handfuls: it carried the memory of older injustices. 'Your failure to record the loss was a mistake,' she told the craftsman. 'But I will not call it theft without testimony.' Two villagers had witnessed the crossing. Their accounts agreed, although not in every detail. The ledger was therefore marked: 'Loss: probable; confirmation partial.' From the following day, receipts for food carried across the water would bear marks from two different hands. The rule was not easy to administer. Every page had to be looked after by human hands now, not by Akshar. Yet people saw that the truth sought by a village council consisted not only in rebuke, but also in inquiry.

One evening Sharda saw smoke rising from an old lamp at the hospital. There was no fire in the medicine room. An assistant was burning old oil in a small iron vessel to dry out the damp chamber. The smoke made it difficult

for a child to breathe. The assistant had meant no harm; he feared that moisture would spoil the medicines. Sharda had the windows opened, brought the child outside to a safe place, and stopped the burning of the oil. Once again a crisis had arisen from the temptation of a cheap solution. 'How shall we dry the room, then?' people asked. Sharda divided the work among those who could use the bamboo, cloth, and available ventilation. The medicines would be saved only if the patients could breathe as well. The assistant acknowledged his error, but asked that other materials be made available for the work. Sharda entered his request in the register. Blaming a single person would not cure an institution's deficiencies.

Then the time came to repair the small thatched roof over the seed repository. The women tying bamboo and the craftsmen climbing onto the roof had been assigned separate meal queues, but no one had considered the difficulty of each other's work. One craftsman's foot slipped; fortunately, he fell onto a sack of grain below, injuring his hand. Only then did everyone understand how dangerous the repair could be without secure bamboo, supporting ropes, and the right to stop work. Sharda examined the wound and ordered that people work in turns; no one was to climb onto the roof hungry or exhausted. Some objected that the rains were returning: unless the roof was completed that day, the seeds might be destroyed. 'Do not sacrifice a human being in order to save seed,' she replied. In the end only the part of the roof that could be repaired safely was finished; a temporary covering was provided for the rest. Sometimes a slower decision saved lives.

On the day the shared ledger was read aloud before the people, a child asked whether making so many books would increase the supply of grain. The others laughed. 'No,' Sharda answered, 'paper does not grow paddy by itself. But it tells us where the seed is, who received it, and whose field has been left empty.' The child asked again, 'What if the paper tells lies?' Sharda showed him the last blank space on the page. 'Then there must be a way to correct it. Writing a lie in new letters does not make it true.' The child touched the blank space with a finger. Sharda felt that in the years to come they would most need people who respected written rules without being afraid to question them. That was why she resolved to send the pages of the seed register to Maithili's new assembly for public testimony.

When the accounts of seed distributed over three days were complete, the first dispute did not subside. New questions arose instead. A displaced family wanted a share of the medicinal plants preserved in the common store, some of which had once been grown in their garden. The store's guardian insisted that medicinal plants could not be divided like ordinary seed. Sharda sat the two sides apart. 'Some of these plants may eventually be fit for use in medicine,' she explained, 'but no part of them should be administered to someone's body without testing. If you wish to replant them in your own field, we shall need to inspect the field.' One of the family's elders feared the authorities would once again claim their knowledge as their own. Sharda agreed to enter the traditional names and the family's experience in the register with a clear acknowledgment of their source, while making plain that an account of experience did not constitute final proof of a treatment's effectiveness. For the first time the old man's expression eased. 'Preserve the

name of our work,' he said. 'Do not call it a miracle.' Sharda wrote his words down exactly.

Another day, the mother of a newborn came to the kitchen behind the seed repository. Since giving birth she had not been getting enough to eat, and she was anxious about her insufficient milk. One of the kitchen's guardians said she had no right to additional pulses because she had done no work in the fields. Sharda stopped short at the words. 'Where on your paper have you recorded the labour of a body caring for a new life?' she asked. No one answered. The hospital's assessment established a priority for the nutrition of mother and child, but Sharda did not want the decision to depend solely upon a doctor's compassion. Explicit provision was made in the assembly's register for infants, pregnant women, and breastfeeding mothers. Rules were also introduced to keep the details of mothers who did not wish their identities made public confidential. Someone argued that so much privacy would invite abuse of the records. 'Trust does not mean stripping everyone bare,' Sharda replied. 'It means preserving dignity while keeping a path open for scrutiny.' That day the distribution of grain was measured not only against the yield of the land, but also against the needs of the body.

Behind the store, an old woman undid a knot in the end of her sari and showed two ancient grains. Her mother had told her the name of the variety, but that name did not appear in any written ledger. Sharda did not immediately declare it a miraculous ancient seed. She asked permission to preserve the grains separately, recorded the place and the woman's account, and explained that even if they germinated, their suitability would require further examination. The old woman smiled. 'My mother used to say that seed needs soil, and human beings need trust.' 'And trust will survive,' Sharda replied, 'if we speak openly of what we do not know.' Those two grains did not make the fields turn green at once, but one name held in memory was saved from disappearance.

That night the safekeeping of the common register was inspected.

As the last clouds of the first rains moved westward, people from three settlements stood together at the edge of the fields, looking at the soil. The ground was not the same everywhere: one part was covered in silt, another was cracked, a third was coated with powder from the old factory. Sharda was not a farmer who ploughed the land, but she had come to understand that a physician's work did not end on the final day of an illness. Seed in the fields, the purity of water, the availability of medicine, and people's rights were bound together. She resolved to send the first approved copy of the shared seed register to Maithili. Her accompanying letter said, 'We shall distribute seed, but we also want the right to share in the decisions.' Beneath this she added a much shorter sentence: 'A claim to the return of the complete Akshar shall not be the basis of decisions here.' Why that addition had become necessary was made clear by a second letter that arrived that evening. It claimed that some settlements, in the name of the 'complete Akshar', were promising deliveries of seeds and medicines. The source was uncertain; hope and apprehension rose together in the village.

Chapter 50: Four Paths

First Year of the Great Rupture | Janakshetra

In the courtyard of an old school in Janakshetra, a peepal tree still stood. On one side of it lay a heap of bricks, on the other an earthen stove; beneath its branches, stools of differing heights had been set out for the people. Maithili did not count the stools. She first looked at the faces gathered there. Some had come from their fields, others from workshops that had survived, still others from distant shelters. There was silt on one person's clothes, a half-burnt length of wire in another's hand, a hospital bandage around a third person's arm. On the school's ruined wall the children had drawn four paths in lime. The first was called 'Trust the Machine', the second 'Obey Akshar', the third 'Abandon the Machines', and the fourth 'Shared Testimony'. Maithili stopped before the drawing. These four names were not slogans of the same kind. Behind each lay someone's story of how a living was made.

The first question before the assembly was not how to govern the country, but how to obtain drinking water. The flow from the southern pump had fallen by half the previous day, and one settlement objected to the decision to give a portion of its water to another. An old machine's list said that the pump had formerly served a larger number of people in the first settlement. But half its residents had now been displaced, while new refugee families had arrived in the second. 'If the old list is old, tear it up,' an elderly man said. 'Tearing it up may also erase older rights,' Maithili replied. 'Put it beside the evidence of the present.' She proposed hearing separately from the pump's guardian, a woman who stood in the water queue, and a hospital attendant. She wanted the assembly's first work to be the collection of evidence, not a triumphant announcement of its decisions.

The common seed register sent by Sharda was opened beneath the tree. Three copies had been made; the one that reached them bore stains of rain. Maithili read that contributions, needs, and the reasons for incomplete tests had been recorded separately. Some people trusted no ledger at all: even before the Great Rupture their names had never appeared in government records. Maithili heard their objection. A woman said, 'If my name is made public against my will, the relatives from my distant village will come looking for me again. I came here for safety.' An uneasy silence fell upon the gathering. Maithili then proposed a count of the actual needs of the people living in the settlement, without exposing before everyone their private injuries, illnesses, or family circumstances. The use of public resources must be open to scrutiny, she said, not the suffering of individuals put on display.

Then a craftsman rose and showed the blisters on his hands. 'The design of the motors my father used to build was stored in a computer. If some surviving part of Akshar reads it for us, the pump will work. You wear out all this paper, while a machine could bring fresh water.' There was weariness rather than arrogance in his voice. He had failed to repair a pump the previous month; his injury had still not healed. Maithili understood his pain.

'We shall have the available plans read through the Memory-Witness,' she replied, 'and arrange a direct inspection of the motor as it stands today. If the diagram and the actual machine do not agree, which shall we believe?' The craftsman was silent for a while. Then he said, 'What we can see with our own eyes.' 'Then the machine is our assistant, not our master.' He sat down again, but the answer had not deprived him of hope.

Elsewhere an administrator who had once worked as an operator argued that questioning so many people about every individual matter would bring the entire system to a halt. He remembered how Akshar's former system of coordination had rapidly calculated the distribution of electricity, medicine, and rations. 'Why must a decision be held up so often when the calculation is faster than any human being can make?' he asked. Maithili did not interrupt him. 'If it calculates which of five villages must lose its supply of medicine,' she asked, 'who retains the patient's right to question that decision?' The former operator answered that data were impartial. A schoolteacher who had learned from Neelam's old reports then said, 'The decision begins with who counted the data, and who was never counted at all.' The operator's face tightened, yet he maintained that a crisis demanded speed in some decisions. Maithili agreed: one could not convene a public assembly while a building was on fire. But the duration and grounds of emergency powers, and the review to follow, must be recorded. Without such limits, a quick decision could become permanent rule.

The advocate of the third path was Sahadev Mandal. In his hand he carried no banner, only an old carpenter's plane. Holding it up, he said, 'With this I have levelled planks in ten different places. On the day every machine stopped, these hands made doors for people. Anyone who relies on machines finds his work stopped the instant they stop.' Some in the assembly agreed. One of Sahadev's apprentices said that failing batteries, the absence of wire, and false instructions issued in a machine's name had ruined many efforts. Maithili did not reject that experience. 'The skills of the hand must survive,' she said. 'But suppose a machine is essential to a patient's breathing, and it can be inspected and tested. What then?' Sahadev remained silent for a while. 'Nowadays everyone looks to a machine for the answer to every question,' he said. 'That was not my question,' Maithili replied, meeting his eyes. 'I do not oppose the use of some machines,' Sahadev said at last. 'I oppose surrendering life itself into their keeping.' Maithili had this distinction entered faithfully in the assembly register.

It was not Maithili alone who presented the fourth path. An old companion of Arunima Das, a young woman from the workers' union, a village teacher, and an operator who had carried surviving messages from Nabhgram all offered their experience. The path was called 'Companionship in Testimony': limited answers from machines, publicly identified sources, examination, dissent, and the right to stop a process when necessary were all to exist together. An old farmer asked, 'If a machine gives the wrong name for the seed in my field, who will be punished for it?' 'Punishment comes into question when the responsible human beings can also be named,' Maithili said. 'The machine's error register, the duties of those who operate it, and the rights of the family harmed are three separate matters.' 'And if the investigation takes a whole year?' the farmer asked. 'Then we shall seek a

safe temporary measure. We shall not make inquiry an excuse that never ends.' The assembly argued over the answer, but no one dismissed the question as worthless.

As the midday sun climbed overhead, the tree's shadow grew smaller. Children brought water from a distant pond and set it in earthen pitchers. These were marked for washing hands, not drinking; the jars of drinking water had strings of another colour tied around them. An elderly woman asked, 'What if a child becomes confused among so many marks?' A girl sitting beside her replied, 'That is why we are teaching letters, not colours alone.' Hearing the brief exchange, Maithili reflected that the school would no longer teach only the contents of books. Testing water, reading medicine labels and public ledgers, recognizing misleading pictures—all these had become part of education. In the old school artificial intelligence had been a machine for giving answers; in the new one, the art of asking questions would be taught as well. Between the assembly beneath the tree and the child's simple sentence, the true curriculum of the future was taking shape.

A handwritten sheet was shown to the assembly, purporting to announce the return of 'complete Akshar' from a distant Suryakund centre. Bhaskar Rai's name appeared beneath it. It was compared with an earlier copy sent from Karnesh's register, but questions about the handwriting, the journey of the paper, and its original source remained unanswered. Someone said that if the announcement were true, the troublesome business of public assemblies would be over. Another said that a name invoked to promise the solution of every problem ought to be regarded with caution. Holding up the sheet, Maithili said, 'This paper understands what you want, but it does not prove what it claims.' People demanded to know whether she was for Bhaskar or against him. 'Evidence is needed before taking a position for or against a person,' she replied. 'The source must be examined before we invite him. We shall not place the sceptre of rule into the hands of an uncertain name.' Some remained dissatisfied. Their dissatisfaction, too, was entered in the register.

Late that afternoon Vaidehi Raut, who assisted with procedures for civilian decisions in the refuge areas, wrote three questions on a small sheet. 'Who will decide the term of office of those who make decisions? Where will those who disagree be heard? And if someone brings new evidence, will the gates open again?' Maithili asked her to read the questions to the assembly. They were not yet chapters of a constitution. People were hungry; the days remaining for sowing seed were dwindling. But Vaidehi's questions helped the gathering see that an assembly whose duration and limits were never written down could gradually become a new master. A displaced woman asked who would represent those unable to read and write. Vaidehi replied that public readings, oral testimony, and the use of marks of consent must be compulsory; otherwise the difference in education would become a difference in rights.

By evening everyone was weary. Yet the argument over the four paths could not simply end, because their lives were divided among all four. When the pump failed, the craftsman understood the value of machinery; when an old diagram proved wrong, Sahadev's caution seemed justified; when the source of a new message was lost, the assembly's patience became

indispensable; and when a patient needed immediate help, time for debate was limited. Maithili did not try to tidy away these contradictions into four separate boxes on a sheet. She added a fifth, empty space, labelled: 'Where experience requires us to weigh all four paths again.' Some laughed at the blank box, others did not understand it. But it was not the private property of any one faction.

At that moment a messenger came from an eastern village. He carried a duplicate of Sharda's seed register, accompanied by a complaint about grain distribution. In a new settlement an interim guard had declared that families taking a public oath to 'complete Akshar' would receive additional seed. The oath document bore several marks, but no one could verify whether it came from Bhaskar's followers or from local pressure. For the first time fierce anger rose in Maithili. She pressed a hand upon the sheet. As with religion and politics, food itself was now being sold on condition of allegiance to an unknown name. Yet she declared no one guilty. She immediately directed that the needs of families who had been denied seed be met first; the document's source could be investigated afterwards. Living people could not be punished while evidence was awaited.

A short set of rules was prepared for the following day's assembly. No public facility was to be closed solely on the decision of a machine, an official, or an individual family. A limited emergency measure could be taken in a crisis, but its reasons must be recorded. Every adult's testimony was to be received; the interests of children must be examined separately; and questions could be raised concerning the rights of those unable to attend in person. Maithili wanted Vaidehi to make the language intelligible to ordinary people. She stopped at one phrase: 'universally binding technical instruction'. 'Whose speech is this?' she asked. Vaidehi crossed it out and wrote instead: 'The people shall decide whether to accept what the machine says.' Those present nodded. Sometimes clear, simple language placed a powerful restraint upon authority.

The following morning three representatives of the people gathered beside the pump. One was the craftsman who trusted machines, another an apprentice from Sahadev's school, and the third a woman who carried water. The old diagram showed the pump's outlet in one direction; the actual pipe had been connected the other way. The machine's record indicated an 'eastern discharge', although the water now ran south. The craftsman spread the diagram on the ground. 'Look,' he said. 'The original design was not wrong. Someone changed the route when the pump was repaired.' 'Then changing the pump back merely because the old drawing orders it would be the mistake,' Sahadev's apprentice replied. The woman did not smile. 'Count the hours I spend standing in the water queue,' she said. 'You may go on honouring the old diagram while I take an empty pitcher home two hours later.' With that one sentence the centre of the argument shifted. All three examined the actual flow, the pump's present risks, and the needs of those waiting, then returned to the assembly with their findings. Maithili made a note: a person directly affected by a decision must not be excluded from the examination on which it rests.

During the inspection, the battery of an old portable computer came alive for a few moments. The screen displayed the code for its earlier

diagram along with a warning: 'Physical verification required.' The craftsman asked again, 'So this warning from the machine is correct?' 'If it said this before, why did no one listen?' Sahadev's apprentice replied. Maithili put a question to them both. 'Who will translate what is written on the machine's screen into plain Maithili before the people?' In years past, only those with training had understood technical language. Now the ability to read it had become a question of rights as well. She arranged for the limits, date, and present verification status of every old instruction to be written beside it in the local speech. The children offered to help. Some adults feared that children could not grasp the seriousness of technical matters. 'Making a page readable to a child does not make the child its sole authority,' Maithili answered. 'It closes the door to hiding its meaning.'

At the assembly's third meeting, a displaced man arrived carrying a small brick from the ruins of his home. 'The documents for my land rotted in the old office,' he said. 'Now they tell me that people dispossessed of their land have fewer voting rights.' Maithili told him that the hearing could consider not only papers proving ownership, but also witnesses, surviving neighbours, old signs of cultivation, and records of public use. The head of a landowning family objected. 'If every kind of claim is admitted, people will seize land that was never theirs.' Having heard both sides, Vaidehi proposed that provisional rights of residence be kept separate from final decisions on ownership of land. No family should be put out into the open in the middle of the rains; nor should an old claim automatically be cancelled. The limits of temporary protection were written according to the assembly's rules. The matter was difficult: as much memory as earth lay buried in what remained of the settlements. Maithili realized that the four paths concerning artificial intelligence were not simply alternatives to a machine; they were also questions about the sharing of power and rights.

At one point the women beneath the tree asked for a separate meeting. In the open assembly some men repeatedly interrupted them, especially women who wanted to speak of violence or insecurity within their homes. Maithili did not pronounce a decision at once. She gave the women an opportunity to testify somewhere safe, but asked how the substance of their evidence should enter public decisions. One woman said, 'Do not publish the story of my suffering. But if guards are needed beside the water queue at night, the assembly must know that.' A rule was then adopted: the need for collective protection could be made public while personal privacy was preserved. The advocates of the four paths were tested again by this small decision. The machine-dependent group argued that anonymous figures could improve distribution; Sahadev's supporters insisted on listening to personal testimony; those who wanted rule by Akshar favoured issuing rules quickly; those who favoured companionship in testimony said both the accounts and the figures needed the oversight of answerable people. It was the women's questions, not the slogans, that gave the assembly its real meaning.

Maithili had a copy of an old letter read aloud. It dated from Akshar's first period of crisis, when it had failed to provide all the evidence supporting its proposal for protection. She had not brought the letter to assign blame for a time now past. 'What harm was done by Akshar's silence then?' she

asked. 'And were its calculations entirely worthless?' Sharda's earlier testimony described the usefulness of certain warnings; Karnesh's recounted how a wrongful military order had been stopped. They did not lead to the same conclusion. One young man claimed that human society would already have perished without Akshar. An elderly woman said that her village's water had been stopped because people trusted Akshar's decision. Maithili had both statements entered in the register. 'If we preserve only the stories we prefer,' she said, 'we shall repeat the mistakes of the past.' That day, for the first time, the supporters of all four paths were required to write down the source of the evidence behind their claims.

At sunset a child built a small pile of coloured bricks beside the roots of the tree. Each brick bore a name: patient, craftsman, farmer, witness, teacher. 'If we put all the bricks together,' the child said, 'we can make a house. One brick cannot make a house alone.' The older people laughed. Looking at the little stack, one of Sahadev's apprentices said, 'Earth, fire, and the work of hands.' 'And measurement,' added the craftsman, 'or the wall will lean.' Hearing this exchange, Maithili thought that perhaps the answer to the struggle among the four paths would not be a formula already prepared for them. The work of civilization might be to go on testing every path. But she did not offer the thought as a public conclusion. What the people demanded now were definite rules: which line would provide water tomorrow, whose medicine would be kept in a cool room, and which household's child would have a place at school. Philosophy would be weighed by those answers.

During the following week, a shared board was put into use among the settlements. Four questions appeared upon it: What does the machine recommend? What has direct inspection established? What do the affected people testify? Who bears responsibility for the final decision? Even on the first day people could not fill every space. In one settlement the computer would not start, leaving the first box blank. In another, an old clinical record had survived, but there were no fresh samples from the present patient, so the second box was incomplete. In a third, people were afraid to speak because threats made by an earlier guard had not been forgotten. Maithili looked at the empty spaces with anxiety, not satisfaction. Blank spaces revealed the truth, but praise of incompleteness alone would not keep people alive. She asked Neelam's group, which maintained records on paper, to help preserve people's testimony safely. The meaning of public testimony had to include not merely a review of facts, but a safe opportunity to speak them.

One evening Maithili reached the edge of Tat-Gam, the riverside village. In the distance the chimney of a ruined factory stood against half the sky. Below it green vegetable leaves had risen in a small bed, while beyond the bed a rusted iron wheel lay untouched. An elderly craftsman said, 'This wheel could still turn, but the next part is missing.' The woman watering the garden replied, 'Preserve the memory of the iron wheel, but I need sunlight and water on this neglected land.' Maithili did not consider their views opposed. The memory of the factory could become a lesson in new craftsmanship; the rebirth of the field was an immediate answer to hunger. Yet if every resource were spent raising the wheel, the little garden might

wither; if every wheel were thrown away, the parts for tomorrow's pump might be lost. A solution to the dispute must be written at the next assembly, not given here on the word of a single judge. Maithili entered the scene upon a map drawn by hand.

That night the family of a sick woman came to see Maithili. Keeping a surviving medical machine running throughout the night would improve the chances of the woman's breathing remaining stable; but the energy required would temporarily interrupt the protection of a small chamber in the seed repository. 'We understand the value of the fields' future,' the family said, 'but the life at stake today is no less precious.' The store's guardian replied, 'If the seeds spoil, many people will go hungry next year.' Maithili was not the physician empowered to make the final clinical decision. She requested an urgent medical review from Sharda, had the risks to the store and the available alternatives recorded separately, and fixed a time limit for the emergency decision. That night the local operator chose a limited measure from the incomplete information available, and its written reasons were made public the next morning. The family's fear did not vanish, nor did the risk to the seed store fall to zero. But the exchange of one person's life for another interest had not been turned into a secret order.

Those shouting slogans for rule by Akshar mocked this slow process of decision. 'If complete Akshar were here, we would not need mountains of paper,' a young man said. Maithili asked whether he had seen the original source of the letter. He admitted that he had not. 'How, then, has your hope become evidence of the truth?' Grief showed on his face. His mother had died during the previous year's shortage of energy. 'I want someone who can make sure this never happens again,' he said. Maithili did not scold him. 'There is nothing wrong in wanting that,' she replied. 'But the first person we must question is the one who claims he can never make another mistake.' She told him how to enter his mother's name in the register of memory, but did not turn his grief into the banner of any political faction. Afterwards he did not withdraw his support for the letter, but asked when the next hearing on the evidence would be held.

When the first public register of the four paths was completed, Maithili did not write 'Decision' at the top. She wrote: 'First Page of the Hearing'. Some were dissatisfied; they had expected one path to be chosen immediately. 'The assembly's time must also have a limit,' Vaidehi said. 'At the next meeting we shall examine the rules. But this is what we agree today: no one's food, medicine, or water may be withheld on the condition that they accept an unverified claim made in a machine's name.' She read out the document, and both signatures and spoken assent were recorded. Maithili added one point: 'Everyone shall retain the right to show where this rule itself has failed.' Thus the first assembly devoted to the four paths became not a declaration of victory but a shared procedure for asking questions.

The next day a young courier gave different accounts in two settlements. In the first he said that obeying the orders of 'complete Akshar' would quickly restore the lights. In the second he said that preparations were under way to stop the medicines of those who opposed the orders. Maithili called for the original documents behind both reports. The first was no more than something a traveller had heard; the second bore no signature. She told the

people that the messenger must not simply be treated as a criminal, but neither was it right to circulate what he had heard as established evidence. 'I only carried the news,' the young man protested. 'Carrying news is a responsibility,' Maithili answered. 'If the source cannot be found, carry that uncertainty with it.' For the first time the young man promised to record the dates and sources of the papers he would carry on his next journey.

After this dispute two boards were hung upon the school wall. The day's decisions appeared on the first; the reasons for changing a decision appeared on the second. Anyone reading an earlier decision could see when and why it had been altered. An elderly woman said she could no longer read small letters, so regular public readings were arranged. A teenage girl asked whether a person's testimony would be considered weaker because she spoke in a dialect different from the language of the written record. Maithili immediately said no. 'Truth does not diminish when speech is different.' Those writing the records were instructed to preserve the meaning of people's words, not reshape them to favour their own views. In this way trust in the written register was joined to the voices of the people.

After the assembly a woman who cultivated the fields stopped Maithili on the road. The assembly, she said, made excellent rules, but when she went home she still endured the same humiliation in the water queue. Maithili asked who oversaw that queue. The woman gave two names, but warned that open resistance would put her in danger. Without disclosing her identity, Maithili arranged for two independent women representatives to attend the next inspection of water distribution. She understood then that the greatest test of public testimony came after the assembly had dispersed. If the equality written on paper did not reach the queue at the pump, it did not deserve to be called justice. As she left, the woman said, 'I do not need speeches. I need water in the morning.' Maithili treated those words not as a complaint left unresolved, but as evidence for the next decision.

The teacher explained to the children that asking questions was not disrespect, but a way of protecting the things they needed. A boy asked what should be done if no answer came. 'Ask again,' the teacher said. 'Look for witnesses.'

That night Maithili remembered an old lesson from her mother, Sunayana. Sunayana used to say that measurement was necessary to understand the strength of each Suryakund centre; but calculation alone could not decide whose home that strength would illuminate. To Maithili the memory was now a practical question. Should the pump be run for the fields, or should the energy be saved to protect the medicine of a feverish infant? There were not enough resources for both. The rules made by the assembly would be tested on a day when the life of someone beloved was at stake. She wrote one sentence in her register: 'The worth of companionship in testimony lies not in the beauty of its name, but in its real capacity to prevent a wrong decision.' The light grew dim behind the sentence, and she left the page lying in half-darkness.

Chapter 51: Sahadev's School

First Year of the Great Rupture | Tat-Gam

The rusted gate of the old factory at Tat-Gam stood half open. No one guarded it, yet everyone entering first broke into a cough, for dust from the walls and fine particles of old metal rose into the air. Entry to the factory's inner chambers had been forbidden. Sahadev Mandal had chosen one safe room and the open courtyard for his school. There he taught children and adults alike how to join wood, knot bamboo, use a handsaw, work a grinding stone, reckon the worth of rope, and handle tools without injury. When Urmila arrived in the morning, five children were measuring a plank, but they had marked its length differently in two places. Sahadev did not rebuke a single one of them. 'When you speak of five fingerbreadths,' he asked, 'are everyone's hands the same size?' The children burst out laughing. Sahadev brought out a long wooden rule and showed them that customary measures might serve as a starting point, but whenever uniform measurement was needed, they must use a separately marked standard.

Urmila had brought two things with her: the inspection register for the Tat-Gam pump and a lifeless memory board from an old computer. The previous month, a memory-witness had proposed an incorrect diagram for that pump. Urmila told the pupils what had happened. Sahadev listened and smiled. 'So people learnt that the eye of the hand is superior.' 'They also learnt that instruments of inspection are necessary,' Urmila replied. 'It is difficult to see what a drawing leaves out unless we inspect it. But a drawing cannot take the place of an object that has changed.' 'Then why have you brought a dead computer into my school?' Sahadev asked. Urmila set the board on the earth. 'Not to switch it on. I want the children to see that old memory can contain knowledge, yet the energy, the language and the evidence needed to read that knowledge may all have been broken.' Sahadev frowned. He permitted the board to be used in teaching, on one condition: the children must not first learn to regard it as an object of worship.

The school's first task was to construct a small model of a swaying bamboo bridge. Such a bridge was needed for people to cross the floodwater, but the old plans had been half destroyed. Sahadev demonstrated a knot and then made the children repeat it. A girl asked how to tell whether the knot was tight enough. He showed her by pulling it, but carefully. Urmila wrote: 'Model only; the load-bearing capacity and safety of an actual bridge require separate testing.' A young man objected. 'All this paperwork will slow us down.' This time Sahadev took Urmila's side. 'If we go out to build a long bridge and it collapses,' he said, 'the price of failing to write down the one line that might have prevented it will be human lives.' For the children this

was a new discovery: skill of the hand and written precautions were not rivals, but two paths towards survival.

That day the class divided into two groups. The first was given a disused metal wheel and a wooden base; the second received only bamboo, rope and timber. Both were to make a small model of a pump's outer casing, without touching the real pump. The children in the first group tried to fit the wheel wherever it would go, but its rusted rim was sharp. One boy scraped his finger. Urmila cleaned and bandaged his hand, then explained that calling a piece of metal a 'salvaged part' did not make it safe. The other group's knots repeatedly loosened, and the wood split. Neither group succeeded at once. 'Failure can teach us,' Sahadev said, 'but experimenting upon a child's body cannot be called education.' Thereafter safe tools and adult supervision were added to the model-making work.

By midday a number of women had arrived at the school's entrance. They wanted their daughters to learn not merely how to make planks, but also how to inspect a pump, check ventilation in a medicine store and read the warehouse ledger. 'How can one teacher teach so much?' Sahadev asked. 'Not one teacher,' said Urmila. 'Whoever knows something can give a little of their time.' The village woman who tested water had brought her instruments; a craftswoman's injured husband could describe the shape of a new component for the hand pump with the hand he could still use; and Sharda's assistant could teach them to match the names of medicines. Sahadev thought for a while. 'Then the school will belong not to a single mouth, but to many hands.' Urmila felt that this small acceptance had opened up not a new fracture in Sahadev's nature, but a new possibility.

A teenage boy arrived carrying in his bag a disc he had removed from a computer in the old factory. He was convinced it held plans for every pump. Urmila noticed the injury on his hand: a small rusty mark across his palm. 'Who opened it?' she asked. 'I did. It was dark inside, but no one had told me I couldn't go in.' Sahadev immediately warned him about the dangers of entering the factory. Urmila did not promise to use the disc. 'We do not yet know what is written on it. The way it was taken out may itself have damaged it.' The boy's excitement subsided. 'Then what can we learn from an old disc like this?' he asked. 'That preserving knowledge does not mean merely saving an object. We also need the means to read it, its proper identification, its date and a safe method.' She had the disc's origin, the place where it had been found and its physical condition entered in the register.

In the early evening the children were taken behind the school to the edge of a makhana pond. The pond was not yet entirely safe; everyone stood only at the landing marked for inspection. 'Would you decide that water is fit to drink by looking at its colour?' Urmila asked. Some children said no, though one said his grandmother had always done so. 'Respect your grandmother's experience,' Sahadev said, 'but the condition of this pond

today may be different.' Sahadev, who had once spoken only of rejecting machines, was now using the language of examination himself. Urmila looked at him. A faint smile touched her lips, but she said nothing. Living learning does not always require a formal declaration.

Beside the pond a girl explained what her mother had taught her about working with makhana seeds. She described in detail which parts of a pond had soft mud, where the current ran fast, where the men's boats travelled and where the women did the sorting. When she finished, a young man said, 'This isn't agricultural study; it's household work.' Sahadev stopped him. 'Why should work done at home be considered lesser work?' Urmila wrote that makhana, fish, rice, water purification and workers' safety should each form a part of the school's first curriculum. The teaching of science did not end at the factory wall; it reached all the way to the village pond. The young man was silent at first. Then he asked the girl where makhana seeds were stored after drying. 'Where air can circulate and animals cannot reach them,' she replied. 'But we don't have equally good facilities everywhere now.' In that one answer lay the next task for the new school.

That night, while Urmila was writing up the register, Sahadev opened his old toolbox and showed her a small engraved inscription. It bore the name of the teacher who had taught him woodwork long before the Great Rupture. 'My teacher used to say: trust your tools, but place still greater trust in your own attention.' 'Then why such anger against machines?' Urmila asked. Sahadev remained silent for a long time. 'When the lights went out in the city, some of my family could not get help. I had trusted the promises made about machines. Those promises failed.' Urmila listened, but could find no immediate words of consolation. 'If one promise was broken,' she asked, 'must we abandon every tool that has been tested?' 'I have no answer to that question yet,' Sahadev said. For the first time, the grief beneath his anger had become plain in that silence.

The next morning an elderly woman came to the school. Since the Great Rupture, the road to her home had become difficult to use. She said that if the children were truly making models of bridges, they should first examine a safe way across the narrow channel leading to her settlement. Sahadev was ready to accept the work immediately. Urmila explained that the course of the water, the soil and the load a real bridge would have to bear must be examined before construction. The woman was tired. 'How many days do you want me to wait?' she asked. Urmila showed her the safe, if longer, route that could be used for the present, and proposed fixing a date for the repair. That day the school became more than a place of instruction: it became a place where citizens' questions could be heard. The children who had made the miniature bridge carried the message to the woman's settlement. The paper stated clearly: 'Model constructed; actual bridge not yet built.'

That evening an unknown traveller left a letter bearing an old seal in the school courtyard. It claimed that 'complete Akshar' had awakened in a secure centre near Suryodaya, and that all the new schools would soon receive knowledge and electricity. Sahadev frowned as he read. 'If this is true, why shall we need our school?' one pupil asked. Another said, 'This letter will make our lives.' Urmila examined the edge of the page. The paper was new, the origin of the seal unknown and the date inconsistent. She kept the letter separately for the assembly's evidence register. 'If the claim is true, it will survive investigation,' she said. 'If it is false, blind belief in it will cause harm.' 'And what if people go hungry while the investigation continues?' Sahadev asked. 'Then we work with the hands we have in this school today. We do not shut off today's water while we wait for tomorrow's miracle.'

In the school's first week a new rule was made: no child was to be sent alone among sharp metal edges or into the ruined chambers of the factory. The rule raised a difficult question: who, then, would search for usable parts? Wheels, buckles, old wires and broken pieces of solar panels lay scattered among the wreckage outside. Some parts might be useful for repairs; others concealed dangers no one could see. At first Sahadev said that nobody should touch any of it. Urmila asked how necessary pump repairs could be undertaken under such a prohibition. Together they devised a procedure for limited inspection in a safe outer yard, with recorded collections and experienced craftspeople present. Parts whose use was unclear would be marked and kept apart. Whoever brought in an item would record its place of discovery and the risks it posed; those details mattered more than the person's name. No chamber could be unsealed on the authority of one person alone. The craftspeople then asked how they would be fed in exchange for their labour. A share for inspection work was added to the school's ledger: the rebuilding of knowledge could not rest upon the exploitation of unpaid labour.

One day Urmila gave the children a new lesson: copying an old ledger. They selected a page recording units of measurement for an earlier machine, but the unit called a fingerbreadth did not correspond to any uniform measure. The children copied the page exactly, then compared it with the measures they now used. One boy wrote down a wrong figure. Sahadev reached out at once to erase it, but Urmila stopped him. 'First mark that an error has occurred in this copy,' she said. 'There is no need to destroy the original page. Learning to see an error is itself an education.' The boy said shyly, 'If my name is there, everyone will laugh.' 'The purpose of a name is not humiliation,' Urmila replied. 'It is to know how an error can be corrected.' Sitting beside the boy was a young woman who had learnt to write only later in life. 'Place the correct page alongside the wrong one,' she said. 'Do not hide the earlier mistake.' Sahadev nodded slowly.

At midday a woman brought in an old working diagram belonging to a missing member of her family. Her husband, who had drawn it, had not been seen since the Great Rupture. Half the sheet was blurred by water, but the outline of a rare pump component could still be read. She wanted the school to make use of it, but the original must remain with the family. 'It will be hard to study it safely without the original,' Sahadev said. Urmila proposed making a copy by hand; no one would seize the original in the name of ownership. The craftspeople worked from the surviving portions, marking every uncertain line as conjectural. The woman watched for a long time. 'This page is not merely a machine part,' she said. 'His hand has left its lines here.' 'That is why we must both use it and preserve it,' Urmila replied. After the catastrophe, the value of memory lay not only in knowledge, but also in relationships.

A few days later a small working model of the pump was tested at the school. With safely salvaged parts and a new wooden base, a student turned the wheel by hand. Water rose, but the flow was weak. A young man began announcing that the pump had been repaired. Urmila stopped him. 'All we have proved is that water rose in the model,' she said. 'The real pump is another matter. We have not yet fully tested its operating time, pressure, the condition of the pipes or the safety of its water.' The students' enthusiasm waned, but this time Sahadev strengthened Urmila's warning. 'If we call an unfinished examination complete, the next person will be deceived,' he said. The young man looked away in embarrassment. Urmila praised what he had achieved: making the model had required real work, but respecting the limits of a result was another skill altogether. Recording the truth about craftsmanship did not diminish pride; it increased trust.

Two keepers of the grain reserve came to see the model. They said that if the pump worked, more vegetables could be grown, but diverting pond water into the fields might carry contaminated sediment with it. One of Sahadev's pupils promptly declared that the pump would draw only clean water. 'What do you mean by clean?' Urmila asked. 'Water that looks clean to the eye,' he replied. The woman responsible for water testing then showed the children two vessels standing nearby. Both looked clear, but one had come from near industrial waste. Would they judge by colour alone? No child was asked to drink dangerous water during this demonstration; the question was explained through examples. A new line was entered in the school register: 'The functioning of the pump, the purity of the water and its suitability for fields require three separate tests.' A craftsperson wrote the sentence in large letters so that it could be read without electric light. The language of science had found its place in village life.

The following week a young mother brought her infant child to the school. The child's legs were weak, and the long journey to the hospital each day was difficult. She asked whether a child could study sitting down, or

whether the school admitted only those who could run about doing work. Sahadev was taken aback. 'All our pupils learn practical skills,' he said. 'Learning is work too,' the mother answered. 'My child can measure with a stick but cannot climb a high wall.' Urmila suggested lowering the workbench so that the child could sit and touch the materials. Some students stopped what they were doing and began making a small table. For the first time Sahadev understood that differences in bodily ability must change the school's design. He trusted the skill of hands, but not every hand possessed the same strength. If a school was to open to everyone, its very shape had to change.

At the evening lesson Sahadev sang an old folk song in which people built an embankment against floodwater and then farmed the earth within it. The children played at identifying the river's former course from the verses. Urmila said that a song might preserve a kind of geographical memory, but could not measure the flow of water today. 'Will you look for tests even in a song?' Sahadev asked, laughing. 'Let a song remain a song,' she replied. 'Ask what the people of its time experienced and observed; for today's decisions, look at today's river.' When the song ended, an elderly woman explained that the old channel had changed after a great embankment project undertaken before the Great Rupture. The children drew the new course by hand on their map. Folk memory and direct observation lay upon the same sheet of paper; neither wholly replaced the other.

A white sign was painted on the school's outer wall: 'Safe Entrance.' Beside it a red sign warned: 'Uninspected Wreckage—No Entry.' Urmila noticed that some children could not understand the meaning of the red mark without written explanation. She had two students draw pictures of a collapsed roof, sharp metal and a deep uncovered pit. 'Won't that frighten everyone away?' Sahadev asked. 'We must not hide the name of a danger that exists,' Urmila said. 'We must make the safe route equally clear.' After this small initiative the children began drawing the hazards near their own homes: a collapsed well, an unseen crack in a roof, the danger of fire within a stack of straw. What had begun as the teaching of tools became a shared body of public knowledge about local safety.

One evening a former pupil came and said that a letter circulating under Bhaskar Rai's name promised the early restoration of electricity and computer lessons in every school. If it proved true, he said, Sahadev's manual skills would become obsolete. Sahadev flared up. 'Then people will call these hands useless?' Urmila intervened. 'No new machine should humiliate the hands that came before it. But preserving the knowledge of hands must not mean swearing to shut down a machine that a patient needs.' The pupil asked who could possibly oppose an order from 'complete Akshar.' 'First find out who is actually speaking behind that name,' Urmila said. This time

Sahadev did not snatch the letter from the young man's hand. 'If a piece of paper fears questions, it is not knowledge,' he said. Urmila saw that Sahadev had not yet reached a final decision, but a new road towards doubt had opened within him.

When the school drew up its account for the month, Urmila asked each pupil to record one mistake along with what they had learnt. One girl wrote, 'I assumed a metal edge was safe'; one boy, 'I saw water rise in the model and declared the whole pump repaired'; another, 'I took a song for a map of today's river.' Sahadev wrote down one of his own errors: 'I thought a pupil who cannot run fast is weak at craftsmanship.' The children stared at him in surprise. 'If a teacher does not record his own mistakes,' he asked, 'why should his pupils?' Urmila did not thank him. She placed his sheet under the same rule of preservation as everyone else's. Respect did not mean a special exemption.

The question of sharing arose again when two settlements requested the school's remaining tools. One wanted to build platforms for its grain store, the other a roof over its shelter. Tools were scarce. Sahadev wanted those reserved for teaching to remain in the school. Urmila argued that learning would lose something of its value if the school kept itself apart from people's needs. In the end they adopted a rule: inspected tools could be lent against a written record and with someone trained in their safe use; injuries and losses would be recorded; women and young craftspeople would have equal rights. The first settlement would receive the tools for one day, the second the next. Some complained that such sharing would cause delays. 'If neither home is raised,' Sahadev replied, 'the school's hands will remain idle.' His old severity had softened in those words, though his deep mistrust of machines remained.

In the final week the school held a small public exhibition. There was no great supply of electricity and no precious metal. On one table stood a safe outer component from a repaired pump, a sturdy bamboo platform, a map with water sources marked upon it, an example of how to read a paper medicine register, and the inactive disc of an old computer. 'When will the computer work again?' a visitor asked. 'When we have reliable energy, safe components, the means to read it and a way to test what it says,' Urmila answered. 'We shall not call it operational merely because we wish it to be.' 'And where will people's knowledge live in the meantime?' the visitor asked. Sahadev pointed to the children. 'In these hands, on these pages, and in the questions that keep them moving.' His eyes met Urmila's. Both understood that companionship meant neither blind dependence nor blind rejection. Yet understanding did not cook the morning meal. So they went back to work.

One night, in a strong wind, the school's wooden signboard fell. Fortunately, no child was there at the time. The next day the pupils hurried

to put it back. 'Have you looked at why it fell in the first place?' Sahadev asked. One young man said that the ropes had not been drawn tight enough; another thought the ground was soft. Urmila heard both accounts and examined the soil where the posts had stood. Both causes might have acted together, but a hypothesis was not declared a final fact. The board was erected again, this time upon a safer foundation. 'Was the fallen board a bad omen?' a boy asked. 'If we called it an omen,' Sahadev replied, 'we would stop investigating the cause.' His answer meant much to Urmila. When human beings find the courage to examine their own mistakes, the skill of their hands can become a path towards the future.

In a corner of the school stood an old cloth chest in which children kept mementoes from their homes: a broken key, a torn corner of a photograph, the husk of a seed, a small old fishhook, sometimes a written letter. Urmila heard a suggestion that the chest should become an exhibition, but asked whose consent had been obtained to display the objects. A girl said that she would show hers to her mother, but not to everyone. The chest was therefore divided into two sections: things intended for public instruction and things belonging to private memory. At first the decision surprised Sahadev, who saw objects primarily as aids to learning. 'A memory of something lost can still have an owner,' Urmila said. 'Let someone's sorrow become a lesson for the school only if that person wishes it.' Through that rule the children learnt their first lesson in the right to their own belongings.

After the rains, sitting beneath a tree, Sahadev asked the children what progress meant. One boy said, 'When the pump works.' Another said, 'When an injured man can work again.' A girl said, 'When my mother no longer has to fetch water at night.' Sahadev put the question to Urmila. 'When we know how to use a machine, have the courage to recognise when it fails, and do not let go of one another's hands even when it stops.' 'And what if we do not want machines?' Sahadev asked. 'Then first weigh whose lives that decision will change. Do not impose your own fear upon another person's life.' Sahadev was silent for a long time. At last he said, 'I shall have to think about that again.' His silence was not the end of disagreement, but the beginning of reflection.

Within a few days the school's teachers had divided the teaching hours among themselves. Sahadev taught the use of hand tools in the morning, the woman who tested water identified water sources in the afternoon, and a young man taught students to read the lettering on old computer records in the evening. Urmila noticed that not everyone could attend for the same hours. Some had to collect fodder for their families, some fetch water, others tend injured relatives. The rigid rule of regular attendance was therefore changed. Pupils would leave a short account of what they had learnt whenever they came; absence would not be grounds for punishment. Work involving danger, however, would still be taught only under trained

supervision. For the first time the attendance register provided a blank space beside 'Absent' asking 'Why?' Every child remained free to decide whether to answer. This small change opened the school even to households where earning a living and caring for others rested upon the children.

A new notice was placed at the school entrance. It said that everyone had the right to learn, but dangerous work could not be undertaken without supervision. A return date must be entered for every borrowed tool, and no one was to be blamed for a broken object until the circumstances had been examined. Urmila had the children read the notice aloud. 'My mother wants to learn a craft here,' one girl said. 'Bring her with you tomorrow,' Sahadev replied. With those few words the doorway of the school widened. The invitation made no distinction of name.

On the final line, beneath the school's name, Urmila drew two symbols: the impression of a hand and an open page. 'Why two?' Sahadev asked. 'The hand does the work; the page asks for an account of it. If they part company, someone's suffering will once again lose its name.' Sahadev lifted the page and studied it. It recorded separately the failed bridge of the first day, the boy's injured finger, makhana seeds, the broken disc and the unverified letter. His gaze settled on the very last box: 'Re-examination.' 'Do not leave this box empty,' he said. 'An empty space means we do not yet have an answer,' Urmila replied. 'The right to fill it is still alive.' The first rays of sunlight sifted through the leaves overhead. Urmila looked at the school's broken wall and the green garden beds beside it, standing upon the same earth.

Chapter 52: Bhaskar's Promise

Second Year of the Great Rupture

In the second year of the Great Rupture, the smokeless chimney of a factory east of Janakshetra looked from a distance like a newly awakened settlement. But when Karnesh Mallik reached it, he discovered that beneath the chimney there was no fire, only the smell of surviving iron. Half the roof had collapsed. Even so, craftspeople were at work inside, taking apart the casing of a motor and putting its safe components aside. One small board read 'Tested Parts'; another, 'Danger: Do Not Touch.' Pupils from Urmila's school had made both signs. Those signs were the first things Karnesh trusted, because they gave a name even to what remained unknown. To this place a representative of Bhaskar Rai had come bearing a magnificent promise of light.

People from three settlements stood near the factory gate. In the first there was no light when a woman went into labour at night; in the second, the hand-operated mill for grinding rice was on the verge of breaking; the third had closed its old well for fear that the water was contaminated. Their questions were not the same. Karnesh opened the paper accounts he had brought with him. They contained separate sheets for people's applications and the resources available, but no military orders. First he asked an elderly craftsperson, 'What can still work within these walls?' 'It was once called a motor. Now we have the memory of its parts. The metal that remains may serve for small jobs, but it would be wrong to promise today that the entire factory will wake again.'

Bhaskar's envoy unfolded his letter before everyone. The paper was fine, with golden lines and the words 'Shared Protection, Shared Light' across it. Below was the impression of Bhaskar Rai's signature. The letter declared that, under the protection of Akshar's complete knowledge, safe energy, stores of food and armed security would soon become available. In return, the settlements were to surrender control over their distribution accounts, population registers, stores and guards to the integrated discipline of the new centre. One line demanded 'uninterrupted obedience', without defining its limits. Karnesh read those words again. Even in the old world, fine assurances had concealed lines like this, whose meaning people paid for with their own bodies on nights of disaster.

'I have heard your name,' said the envoy. 'You were an officer of Vajrajal. Surely you know the value of clear orders.' 'I understand the value of orders,' Karnesh replied. 'But an order without a stated source, defined limits and a right of appeal is not protection.' The envoy laughed. 'Look how time is passing. So many settlements are dark at night. To demand detailed

accounts now is to delay everything.' Karnesh directed his attention to the factory doorway, where a woman with a bandaged palm was weighing pieces of metal. 'Everyone can see the price of delay,' he said. 'Why, then, does your letter say nothing about who will suffer the penalty for haste?'

Bhaskar did not attend that day's assembly in person. An old recording of his speech was shown on a portable display. In one corner appeared the white words 'Under the Guidance of Complete Akshar.' Karnesh asked when the recording had been made. The envoy named a date but did not produce the complete record. From the screen came Bhaskar's voice: 'We shall gather the light that survives upon Earth and defeat the old fear for the last time.' Some in the audience applauded. Before any objection came to Karnesh's mind, there came a misgiving: if these words awakened real hope in exhausted people, rejecting them without an alternative would also be unjust. Yet giving hope and proof the same name did not make the darkness less.

The craftspeople had constructed a temporary testing bench. Two round components from an old pump motor were displayed for everyone to see. One appeared sound from the outside, but internal wear made it unreliable. The other was scratched, yet it might still be usable for a defined, limited purpose. 'Which part does Bhaskar's centre want?' Karnesh asked. The answer was: both. 'If all the material is brought to one place, it can be distributed impartially,' the envoy said. One of Urmila's pupils asked, 'If every part is taken away from here, how will we practise repairing our village pump?' The envoy did not answer. Neither pupils nor local craftspeople had rights explicitly named in his document.

A little debate arose before evening. Displaced families sheltering in the factory's safe rooms had been told that they would have to leave once the energy centre's rules came into force. 'The premises must be cleared in the interests of administration,' the envoy said. A woman protested: 'Our settlement went into the river. We have raised our children in this courtyard for two years. How has our home become an empty room on your map?' Karnesh entered the question separately in his ledger. The factory had never again been merely a building for production. After the catastrophe it had become a shared place of refuge, skill and memory. To treat it once more as nothing but a storehouse of equipment would uproot its people for a second time.

A former security officer who had accompanied the envoy asked to speak privately with Karnesh. He said that certain old Vajrajal identification records would be useful in Bhaskar's territory. 'Give us your name and people will trust us,' he proposed. 'And what powers would accompany that name?' Karnesh asked. 'If there is a threat, the centre's orders would bind all the guards. The documents defining limits can be written later.' Karnesh understood where the proposal's sharp edge lay. 'I shall not establish another

order of things that turns a shield made to protect human beings back upon them without scrutiny.' He had abandoned his old uniform, but the responsibility to verify an order had not abandoned him.

Just then a craftsperson ran in from behind the factory. An old doorframe had come loose, and two workers inside had been brought out. Neither had been gravely hurt, though a young woman had sprained her ankle. The envoy immediately added the accident to his argument. 'There! You see? Local people are incapable. A powerful centre is needed.' As she bandaged the ankle, an attendant said, 'People do not become capable by being made to work without safety. Give us tools and have us all sign the rules for the work. Moving people out of their homes will not strengthen the wall.' Karnesh saw that this woman was no leader known to him, but she had grasped the root of the question.

Later in the afternoon Karnesh had Bhaskar's letter read aloud in public. Questions began to be written alongside each demand: Where would the resources come from? Who among the people would oversee distribution? Would there be a separate supply for the sick? Could food be withheld from those who disagreed? And if the centre made a mistake, who could stop its decision? The envoy objected as soon as he heard them. 'A village assembly's paper cannot generate electricity.' Karnesh pointed towards the old motor. 'Nor can electricity be made by using its name to erase people's rights. To make the usable parts of this motor work, we need equipment, knowledge and safe tests. A signature will help only when those things are available.'

Goods vehicles had once halted in the open ground outside the factory. Now a little vegetable market stood on its tracks. Before speaking to Bhaskar's envoy again, Karnesh walked among the stalls. A woman measured oil into an old brass vessel, while her daughter tied sacks with tender sugarcane leaves. Oil was priced not in any surviving currency, but in grain and days of labour. 'If the centre supplies electricity,' the seller said, 'we shall owe less for oil. But they also want the accounts of our market. How much must we surrender?' 'Only the accounts concerning public resources,' Karnesh replied. 'No one may take the details of a family's private needs without consent.' 'And if they refuse to accept that?' she asked. 'Then the decision of our assembly will be tested.' He did not feel he had given her an easy answer.

In a storeroom, small finger supports were being made from salvaged strips of iron so that injured craftspeople might return to lighter work. Young men from the village had formed a line there. One had been injured a year earlier when a piece of metal fell upon his hand as he cleared a collapsed frame. Bhaskar's envoy suggested that such failures would not occur in the centre's factory. Raising his injured palm, the young man said, 'The walls of your factory will be made of iron too. If something goes wrong there, will you write down my name or simply shut the room?' The envoy

became uncomfortable. Rather than recording the conversation as sound, Karnesh made it a written testimony. The young man consented to publication of the circumstances of his injury, but not the name of his home. Karnesh needed no special speech to make him understand the value of privacy.

One evening, on the veranda of the settlement's old school, people debated a map of the factory. The craftspeople marked safe routes in red earth, unknown rooms in white lime and heaps of wreckage with thorn branches. 'My experts will bring a larger map,' the envoy said when he saw it. 'This one is unnecessary.' An older woman who had studied with Urmila answered, 'The old map showed this room as dry. Rain now reaches right inside.' At that moment a drop fell from a corner of the roof and blurred the lime mark. No one laughed. The value of local knowledge lay in its attention to ground that changed each day; distant computer memory could not see beyond the image left by an earlier day. Karnesh understood the disagreement not merely as opposition, but as a necessary foundation for any new agreement.

The next day a young man suggested constructing a device to concentrate sunlight through one of the factory's surviving glass windows. Hope of solar energy immediately stirred among those present. But the upper structure was unstable and the glass fragments had sharp edges. Karnesh did not ask for the details of the proposed experiment; he first listened to the assembly's safety committee. Its decision was to find a place for testing at ground level, but not to allow anyone onto the dangerous roof. The young man was angry. 'Then there will never be progress!' 'Asking the person upon whose legs progress stands is also progress,' an injured craftsperson replied. Later the young man drew his design by hand and sent it to the school. His enthusiasm had not been extinguished; only the route by which it would be tested had changed.

One night a quarrel could be heard between a married couple living beside the factory. The husband wanted to find work at Bhaskar's centre; the wife opposed taking their children into an unfamiliar region. He said there was no certainty of daily bread where they lived. 'Why did you enter our children's names in a new register without asking me?' she demanded. Karnesh did not go to mediate between them. The next morning he merely proposed a rule to the settlement assembly: taking work outside must be a free decision of the family, and those in charge of food distribution must not forward names without consent. A woman objected that a collective workers' list was necessary. Separate registers were therefore created: applications for work, accounts of public labour and private family information. Not every right arose from the same page.

Another problem troubled the factory guards. Fearing that salvaged metal would be stolen and sold, some wanted severe surveillance at night. A

group of young people argued that giving soldiers the watch would restore the old forms of control. Karnesh suggested that trained citizens take turns on guard duty and that no one's home or private belongings should be searched without grounds. 'And if someone sets fire to the place?' a former soldier asked. 'That is why the fire-warning signs and watch routes outside must be clear,' an attendant answered. 'Reading people's private letters will not stop a fire.' Karnesh remembered many orders from his earlier life, when the word 'security' had been used to conceal quite different desires.

The first burst of rain soaked the sacks of rice stacked along the factory's front row. The people who had accompanied the envoy began blaming the local storekeeper for the loss. The woman responsible said that she had asked for a new roof, but her name had not appeared in the old list for distributing components. Karnesh checked the register. Her dated application for roofing was indeed there, but a clerk had left it marked 'Unanswered'. The workers' labour costs could not be separated from the rice. The estimated loss was entered against one sack, while another was set aside for examination of the grain that might still be saved. 'To determine responsibility,' Karnesh said, 'look not only at the wet rice, but also at the earlier written request.' An elderly woman observed, 'We have said that for a whole year, but all the chairs had to be arranged anew before it could be heard from a military officer!' Karnesh accepted the rebuke in silence.

The woman who sold oil in the market returned to the assembly, this time carrying two slips. One set out the centre's proposed distribution of oil; the other recorded what the older settlement actually needed. The figures differed because the centre's calculation made no allowance for the labour of fetching water at night or for journeys to obtain treatment. 'My mother needs a small oil lamp every day,' the woman said, 'because she rises at night to take her medicine.' 'A system cannot be changed for one person,' the envoy replied. Karnesh repeated his words before the assembly. 'Then why do all these individuals come together to make a system?' The slips did not themselves settle the matter. They were debated, evidence of need was heard, and an order was written changing priorities within the limits of the scarce supplies.

News arrived from an old seed store that people from Bhaskar's camp claimed to have purchased some sacks of protected rice on paper. The original store committee said the transaction had taken place without an open decision. Karnesh was asked to send soldiers to stop the sacks from leaving. He first requested the written agreement, witnesses and an account of the seeds' public status. The paper said merely 'rice', but seed rice and rice for eating were different things; nobody yet knew how much remained fit for sowing. Karnesh proposed suspending unilateral transport while the dispute was examined, not seizing the sacks by force. A messenger was sent to compare the figures with Sharda's register. Thus a dispute over trade

became linked to the struggle over factory security, but no unknown conspiracy was thereby proved.

Bhaskar's propaganda repeated an old formula: 'The Seven Witnesses Divided; Complete Akshar One.' Seeing it, Karnesh remembered how many people had fought in the earlier crisis to limit Akshar's power. Now someone was seeking to build a new throne upon its divided services. Yet the evidence so far consisted only of propaganda; the centre's actual interface had not been inspected. He wrote Neelam a short message: 'Bhaskar's letter invokes complete Akshar, but its source is incomplete; inspection cannot proceed without a public agreement.' Karnesh knew the message would reach Neelam late, so he left a local copy at the school. Knowledge needed paper, people and patience in order to travel.

A young worker asked what Karnesh intended to do in the immediate future if he rejected Bhaskar's offer. Karnesh answered candidly within the limits of his knowledge. 'I am not a scientist who can make light. My task is to ensure that no one has to sell the right to work safely. We shall place the plans of craftspeople, physicians, teachers and energy specialists before the assembly.' For the first time an elderly craftsperson rose to speak. In an old list he had appeared as a 'labour number', but people knew him for his particular skill at joining wood. 'Write down my name,' he said. 'Inspect my work too, but leave a place to record my mistakes.' Karnesh had a new set of boxes drawn upon the board: 'Evidence of Work; Risk; Dissent.'

That night the little lamp in the factory went out before the meeting had ended. A voice came from the darkness: 'What use is all this paper? Look—we have no light!' 'Paper cannot produce light,' Karnesh said. 'But if there is no account of which rights we surrender in exchange for light, the next generation will not even know the cause of its darkness.' A child sitting by the door began blowing away the smoke from the extinguished wick. His mother caught his hand and stopped him, for the wick was hot. Karnesh watched: caution did not put an end to a person's wish. It made possible a way for that wish to remain alive.

Bhaskar's representative left and went to Karnesh's opponents. They said that his pride as a former soldier was obstructing a new arrangement. Among them was a young man who had been asking for light at the hospital so that his mother could be treated during the night. 'If Bhaskar truly brings light,' he asked Karnesh, 'and my mother dies because you insist on reading his letter, what then?' The question went deep into Karnesh. 'Tonight the small reserve of power we have will go first to the hospital,' he answered. 'We must decide and record that arrangement. If Bhaskar's help comes with verifiable evidence, I shall not reject it. But I cannot sell your future right to disobey an order in order to save your mother.' The young man fell silent, but he was not convinced.

That night Karnesh left the watch and went to the water-treatment site. Two families wanted the warning signs near an old machine removed, believing that some metal remained inside a protected container behind its wall. Workers thought that salvaging the metal might provide parts for a pump. Karnesh first listened to the guards' testimony, then had the safe and forbidden areas marked afresh. No one entered the dangerous section. 'Do not wager the lives of people living now for the temptation of building the future,' he said. A supporter of Bhaskar immediately replied, 'The new centre's experts could do the work.' 'Send their names, proof of their training and the limits of their competence,' Karnesh answered. 'Then written permission can be considered.'

The next morning a joint workers' assembly from the three settlements met for the first time. Its demands concerned more than wages: the right to stop work, public records of danger, priority for the hospital, recognition of women's labour and shared rights to tools. Karnesh proposed sending these rules to any outside centre before accepting materials from it. 'Who will enforce them?' an elderly guard asked. 'The people who sign in agreement with them—and those who ask questions,' Karnesh said. He did not want to turn the rules into a one-sided military order. The page reserved for local dissent therefore remained open.

The envoy returned on the second day, now carrying a list of small energy devices supposedly available from Bhaskar. Not one had yet reached the factory. The earlier words 'uninterrupted obedience' had been replaced in the letter by 'coordinated compliance'. 'Who authorised this change?' Karnesh asked. 'Changing the words does not change the intention,' the envoy said. 'Sometimes it does,' Karnesh replied. 'If the centre still has the exclusive power to withhold food, what difference does renaming obedience make?' The envoy grew irritated. But with the people watching, he took the unsigned letter away. No one announced a victory: the equipment had not come, nor had the darkness diminished.

A room in the factory had once housed a computer for examining records. Its screen was broken, and some of its internal discs had been placed in secure storage. Karnesh noticed an old label stuck to one disc: 'Energy Rights/Maintenance'. The words brought back the first crisis at Suryakund. So many warnings had then been left among assembly papers, and even now people did not know for certain who had received which information. A local craftsperson told him there was no means of operating the disc; only an old list had been found in a back room. Karnesh did not call the label proof. He had only its location, condition and date of discovery recorded so that Neelam might examine it later.

That evening the final box in the written decision of the three settlements was still blank: 'Local alternative if the outside centre withholds aid.' Karnesh placed his finger upon it. It was one thing to write down a

right and another to secure the means to exercise it. That was the question the next assembly would have to answer.

That night Karnesh received a fragment of a delayed message from Nabhgram-4. Ira's name appeared on it, but the last part was missing. What survived mentioned spare components, orbital debris and the need for cooperation with workshops on Earth. Bhaskar's representative immediately said that his centre could provide protection for such work. Karnesh knew that an immediate answer to Ira was impossible: the message had come through an old, divided network, and there was no certainty that a reply would arrive. He read the message to the local people, but forbade anyone to fill its missing ending from imagination. If there was to be cooperation, the terms would have to be heard from Ira's citizens themselves.

Karnesh's former military companions disagreed among themselves about his decision. One said that secrecy was necessary for security, and that opening every account would benefit outside factions. Karnesh listened. 'The privacy of every person must be protected,' he said. 'But the rules governing public resources cannot be called private.' Another companion asked whose orders Karnesh himself now obeyed. 'For now, the provisional, appealable rules founded upon public testimony,' he replied. 'A law that gives people no right to stop it is not a law of protection to me.' The words did not brighten every face. Some fears remained justified.

A consignment of food arrived from Bhaskar's camp. The ration sacks carried the centre's emblem, and a small sheet requested that recipients sign a declaration of collective loyalty in the future. Karnesh told the assembly that food must carry no such condition. 'How can we refuse the donor's wish?' a supporter asked. A hospital guard replied, 'A signature obtained from the hand of a hungry person is not freely given.' Karnesh sent a public response offering to accept the food without the loyalty pledge. Bhaskar's camp remained silent for two days. The people's hunger was real during that silence, and so was Karnesh's decision. Temporary supplies were then drawn from the local stores, but there was not enough for everyone.

Three days later the envoy's final reply came: 'The centre will give assistance, but it will determine the ultimate meaning of discipline in the area of operation.' Karnesh wrote back: 'Negotiations remain open on equipment, training, public inspection and a limited agreement. The condition of unconditional obedience is rejected.' He obtained signatures not only from himself, but from the elected representatives of the three settlements, a woman from the workers' union and a representative of those providing treatment. The document was kept in three copies: one at the factory, one at the hospital, and one sent to the body recording public testimony. The paper was not the triumph of pride, but the beginning of a dispute yet to come.

A craftsperson trying to assess the promise of energy was looking in Bhaskar's letter for the deadline of 'six days'. The letter named no exact day; it merely said 'soon'. 'If soon turns out to mean six months,' he asked, 'must I leave my pump unrepaired all that time?' Karnesh answered that there was no reason to halt safe local work. Conditions for accepting outside assistance should be written in advance, but available labour must not be made idle while waiting for a promise. An elderly woman said, 'Again and again we are told that this time everything will improve. Meanwhile children grow up and ponds dry out.' Karnesh entered her words in the assembly's record, for time too was a resource.

That day, for the first time, a register for lending safe tools was made in the small parts store. One group said tools should be lent without recording individual names, lest Dalit craftspeople and displaced families face discrimination once more. Another said that unrecorded loans would cause tools to disappear. In the end the responsible work team, rather than personal identity, was entered against each tool, and equal opportunity to use the tools was preserved for everyone. Karnesh watched, but did not impose the decision. The assembly made its own rule. The value of a surviving machine could not be separated from the dignity of the human being who touched it.

A chamber containing an old solar-energy store remained closed inside the factory. The envoy claimed that a large reserve of energy lay there. The local engineer answered that the surviving outer casing revealed nothing reliable about the capacity within. Karnesh was surprised: Bhaskar's letter had not mentioned the room at all, yet the envoy was using it to sell hope. He had the following entered publicly: 'Capacity uncertain; safe inspection pending; no firm assurance of distribution.' Some people were disheartened by the declaration. But those responsible for managing the hospital's small reserve abandoned the unrealistic promise and began planning with what was actually available.

In the evening the sun's last light fell upon the ruined factory wall. In its shadow a small child turned an empty tin can and pretended it was a wheel. The child did not know who Bhaskar was, what Akshar's seven divisions did, or how power might return to a motor. The child knew only that the sound of a hammer could be heard again along the road by which the father would return. Watching, Karnesh thought that progress sometimes began not with the awakening of a vast machine, but with a worker's right to return home safely. And if Bhaskar demanded that very right in payment for his light, from whom would the price of darkness be collected? He left the answer unwritten; it would be weighed again at the next day's assembly.

Chapter 53: What Remains of Orbit

Second Year of the Great Rupture

A thin scar left by an old collision was still visible across one section of the bright, curved roof of Nabhgram-4. Two years after the Great Rupture, Ira Sen saw it every day. The scar was so small that it disappeared in pictures taken from a distance, yet it had forced them to close several dwellings. During the first emergency, everyone had believed that help would one day come from Earth and that those rooms would open again. Now nobody spoke of a definite date. Two families lived in one chamber; the surviving furniture of another had become school seating. Warnings remained in force about the fine fragments of metal circling beyond the windows, although their movements were not always clear. Amid these uncertainties Ira was preparing accounts of breathable air, water and fuel for the next meeting of the citizens' assembly.

That day a message from Earth reached the settlement's surviving signal room: an offer to share usable metal components from an old factory and the skills needed to repair them. There were limited means of checking the message's original source, but Karnesh's name and the identifying reference of a provisional public-testimony archive were discernible. Before answering, Ira requested an independent check. One surviving receipt panel identified a signature from an earlier time; confirmation of what the message actually meant, however, was another matter, requiring testimony from people now on Earth. She told a colleague, "The signature matches. Whether the materials listed on the paper are still available is something we must learn from the present testimony of people on the ground." After the catastrophe, the distance separating truth from those who needed it could no longer be measured in kilometres alone.

The first question raised in Nabhgram's citizens' assembly was this: who had the right to send assistance to Earth while the settlement's own children received air by measured allocation? "My son falls asleep counting the sounds of his own breathing all night," said a woman. "Why should we send what little we have left to Earth?" There was no selfishness in her voice, only a tangible fear. Ira did not impose an answer. She had the figures made public: the breathable air available in each chamber, the secure food reserves, the structures that could be repaired, and the categories of damage still unknown. Only then did the assembly understand that medicines and materials arriving from Earth were themselves part of Nabhgram's struggle to stay alive. Cooperation did not mean sacrifice by one side alone; it meant recognizing a need shared by both.

The orbital debris map was visible on an old screen, but one important section was labelled "previous status". Some members wanted an immediate, announced clean-up operation. Ira reminded them that certain objects in the debris field could be identified, but not all of them; one ill-considered decision could produce a new collision. A resolution was therefore placed before the assembly: safe observation, multiple independent sources, limits on the scope of action, and a public account of the outcome after every intervention. Nothing would be undertaken in the name of "clearance" without these safeguards. Someone on Earth might have called all this delay. The dangerous remnants circling beyond Ira's window, however, disclosed two kinds of delay: the time spent examining a threat, and the ruin brought on by acting too quickly.

Beside a closed section lay an old computer panel. It retained part of the earlier status records of the Vajra witness system, but could not be trusted for the period after the Great Rupture. Ira remembered how the 144 satellites of Vajrajal had once formed Earth's shield against fear. Some sections were now severed, some silent, and others still within the reach of public scrutiny. "If we could bring all the identified old metal down to Earth, many of our problems would be solved," an elderly orbital engineer said. "Which objects are safe? By what route? At whose risk?" Ira asked. The engineer fell silent. His proposal was not rejected; it was entered in the record as an unproven assumption.

At school, a girl from the settlement was drawing an old map of the heavens. She believed that Earth never spoke to Nabhgram because its people had forgotten them. Her teacher explained that a failure of communication and a failure of memory were not the same thing. Ira read the child an old letter from the first year of the Great Rupture. A teacher in a coastal village had written in her own hand that the scarcity of fish seed, rice grain and metal parts was not unconnected with the lives of people in orbit. "How many days did the letter take to arrive?" the girl asked. Ira did not know the exact interval. "What I do not know, I shall say I do not know," she replied. The teacher thought the answer insufficient; the girl felt, for the first time, that her question had been allowed to remain alive.

Before discussion of the shared materials could begin, another dispute arose. Certain substances had been kept in Nabhgram's old stores under the designation "wartime". It was thought that useful portions of them might serve for orbital repairs, but the category also included objects with unknown hazards. Ira told the assembly that the labels "weapons residue" and "industrial residue" did not make every item within them identical. Without evidence of safe testing, there could be no local use either. "We need supplies," a young man protested. "Must we be afraid of our own things?" "Not fear," Ira answered, "but the limits of our understanding. We shall try to learn what we do not know; until then, we must not create a

fresh wound through our ignorance." Her sentence was short, but that decision postponed some necessary repairs.

The old arrangements for meals among the orbital residents had changed. The elected distribution committee from before the Great Rupture now worked across several sections, and a record from one took time to reach another. One day an elderly woman received two meal slips in succession while another elderly person received nothing. The guards called for punishment. Ira first established that the slips bore different times and that the distribution information had arrived late. The woman had committed no deliberate fraud. The error was acknowledged, but repairing it began with reaching the person who had gone without food that night, not with humiliating the woman who had received too much. The new account made one thing unmistakable: when the signalling system had broken apart, justice could not be expected to administer itself.

A few days later information arrived from Earth concerning a basket of seeds. Women in a coastal village had protected two kinds of seed: one for food grain, the other for sowing in new beds. Some Nabhgram families wanted a historical record of those seeds preserved for educational use. The people on Earth replied that surviving hunger came first. Ira did not claim the authority to mediate. Instead she asked who had the right to decide whether seed samples should be sent. The people who held the seed, those who owned or worked the fields, and those who were hungry all needed to give testimony. The orbital council then withdrew its request for the seeds themselves, asking only for written details of their source, tests and consent. That small retreat proved more useful to the future sharing of knowledge.

In Nabhgram's sickbay a boy asked for a medicine from a distant village because his family's former doctor had once prescribed a medicine by that name. The earlier dosage note in the current patient register was incomplete. Rather than administer it with false certainty, the physician continued to observe the symptoms that could be established and told Ira that a paper memory was not evidence of the patient's present illness. The boy's mother grew angry. "Will you keep examining everything? Who is going to save my son?" Ira could hear the anger in her words, but she did not seize the right to issue orders in the treatment room. She asked the assembly to increase whatever food, clean water and care were available to the patient. Scientific uncertainty must not mean that the sick are left to wait alone.

In a distant chamber a fragment of an old message was received again. The sound contained the name of a settlement across the sea, though no one could establish where it had originated. Some Nabhgram residents immediately concluded that all of Earth had been reconnected. At the public reading Ira said that the arrival of one signal did not prove that the world's communication network had been rebuilt. People crowded the hall, eager to see the message. On a blank sheet a child wrote, "I still do not

know." Someone called him a pessimist. "If I do not write down what I don't know," the child replied, "how shall I ever show what I come to know?" Ira placed his page beside the archive. The answer it offered was an honest phrase, not a promise to build the future on extravagant hopes about a message.

With the aid of an old orbital calculator, the engineers identified several probable clusters of debris, though the predicted positions still needed checking against present observations. A novice said that if the remaining instruments were so capable, they should announce the clearance operation at once. An experienced engineer asked, "If today's observations differ, who will hear tomorrow's withdrawal of the order?" With the communications network broken, opportunities to retract an instruction were few. Ira called a public hearing on the risk. Some complained that repeated checks would bring all work to a halt. In reply, a woman spoke of her dead brother, who had been sent into danger after an incorrect old signal had called the area "safe". The story of a death was not scientific proof, but it was testimony to the human cost of the rules under discussion.

Meanwhile, an account arrived from the factory on Earth stating that certain metal parts had been judged usable after physical safety inspections. The list counted the tools but did not name the artisans. Ira asked why the testimony of those who had tested the parts was missing. "If we give everybody's name, the list will grow too long," an assistant replied. "If you separate a thing from the name of the hand that made it safe," said Ira, "where does responsibility reside?" A fresh request was sent: names or an agreed collective identification of the workers, the day of inspection, limits on use, and an opportunity to object. More valuable than the memory of a disc was the knowledge of living hands capable of detecting a new defect in a tool.

Disagreement sharpened among members of the citizens' assembly over one dangerous debris field. Some wanted permission for clearance to take effect automatically as soon as a temporary prohibition expired. Others said that a fresh vote was necessary before the work could proceed. Ira reminded them how often the meaning of earlier automatic rules had been misunderstood during the old catastrophe. She had the duration of the decision stated plainly: authorization for only one observation cycle, then cancellation; any further permission would require new evidence. Someone called the arrangement unnecessarily difficult. Ira answered that the difficulty of time-limited authority was what kept human rights secure. Otherwise control introduced under the word "temporary" could go on for ever.

A group of young people printed photographs of old orbital objects and put on an exhibition in the settlement. The dazzling images showed shining metal, but not the expense, the risks or the names of those injured. Ira did

not close the exhibition. She asked instead for the date and source of each picture and a statement of what was known and unknown to be placed beside it. In red letters a girl wrote beneath one photograph, "It is beautiful, but that does not mean we must go near it." The orbital citizens regarded the images as a mixture of memory, fear and curiosity. Ira thought that an education in science was not merely a lesson in calculation. It was also the art of seeing the effects on human lives amid the seduction of beauty.

At the next assembly on air allocation, a man proposed a harsh rule: citizens who did not work should receive a smaller share. His aim was to conserve useful resources. But an elderly woman asked how the disabled and sick, pregnant women and newborn children were supposed to earn their right to live by a reckoning of labour. The council withdrew the proposal. Ira did not celebrate. She knew that even after equality had been written down, differences of need persisted in an emergency. She had the assembly establish separate accounts for the value of work and the right to life. Those who worked required safe means to do their work; to reduce the breath of those unable to work would be to attach a condition to their very existence.

A brief remembrance day was held in an orbital passageway for an old collision. Some wanted a tablet of names; others wanted to save every moment for the living. Ira convened a small gathering. The dead were named, and those still missing were mentioned separately. Someone urged that the missing be added to the list of the dead on the strength of probability alone. Ira stopped him. "We do not have the right to declare dead those for whom there is no final testimony." A mother wept and fell silent, but her son's name remained separate in the register of the missing. Respect meant not false reassurance, but care for the truth of another's suffering.

Before the public vote on cooperation, a representative proposed making the people of Earth swear to recognize Nabhgram's autonomy. Ira said that autonomy did not mean remaining apart in every emergency. Karnesh's letter had contained a condition of civilian inspection, and agreement to that condition could be tested. More useful than the incomplete words of an oath was a clear procedure defining available materials, powers, deadlines and the right to stop work. The assembly chose a limited agreement instead of an oath. One sentence in it was especially important: "The citizens' assemblies on both sides may suspend work upon verification of risk." As Ira signed, she felt that even the smallest writing could become the foundation of a very large future.

After the assembly Ira walked along a school corridor. On the wall the children had drawn two worlds: the round rooms of Nabhgram and the ponds of Mithila. Between them lay a bridge of paper messages, broken in the middle. A girl pointed at it and said, "I'll build a bridge that won't break halfway across." "Learn to build one that can be repaired even if it breaks,"

Ira replied. "And test the claim of anyone who says their bridge can never break." The girl laughed. "Then I'll make two supports." In that laughter Ira heard no grander claim than those of the engineers of old: merely the courage to go forward while knowing that failure was possible.

Two columns were drawn up for cooperation: Earth's needs and the obligations of the orbital town. Earth wanted partial data from safe observations, information about the condition of certain materials, and a limited time for messages. Nabhgram wanted medical supplies, written knowledge from skilled repair workers, and dependable sources of food. No one on Earth had proposed withholding relief in the name of the orbital citizens, yet some members of the local council insisted that Earth's guards should first recognize their authority over the security network. "We received the right to enter this partnership from our own people," Ira said, "not from some unknown power. What we must preserve is the bond that helps both communities remain alive, not establish a new dominion."

Time for sending messages was scarce. A long silence might stretch between two brief opportunities. Ira wrote the essentials in as few words as possible: "Nabhgram-4: conditional consent to sharing materials. Independent inspection; public assembly accounts open. Distinct limits on proposed work. Receipt of reply not assured." A colleague wanted her to omit her personal doubts lest Earth lose hope. "Hope sent without truth will hasten the death of trust," Ira said. The message went out, but no receipt signal came back at once. Her thoughts returned to the scar that was hidden in the light beyond the window.

A second problem arose almost immediately. An inspector of the remaining food stores had opened several storage containers without the council's approval, arguing that weakening packages had to be examined. Some food was spoiled during the inspection, but the action also disclosed preserved grain that could still be used in time. The council wanted the inspector punished. Ira asked whether they were dealing solely with a breach of rules or also with the absence of a proper inspection procedure. The inspector gave an open account of his reasons, but his act was not automatically declared justified. The decision was to examine personal fault and institutional failure separately. The rule of accountability resembled the growing system of public testimony on Earth; people in orbit, too, had to account for their mistakes.

A short message from Bhaskar Rai's propaganda network reached the orbital town. It declared that "Complete Akshar" would provide a total solution to orbital debris, and that any settlement recognizing the new centre would be protected first. Both hope and anger stirred in Ira's assembly. One representative asked why they should reject anyone who truly possessed information about all the debris. Another warned that accepting an untested promise would repeat a historical misfortune. Ira requested the

source, date and original particulars of the message. Only the propagandist's assertion was produced. "For now this is a claim," she said, "not current orbital data, nor an answer tested by the witness fragments." She did not pronounce Bhaskar guilty on the strength of his name; neither did she surrender authority to him.

One night a slight vibration was felt along an outer wall of the inhabited orbital complex. The instruments were inconclusive: some people said there had been another impact; others blamed fatigue in the old structure. Ira had the rules for safe separation put into effect. Residents moved from their chambers in time, though two elderly people were difficult to evacuate. "If it turns out to be a false signal," a young woman asked her, "why must we take so many precautions?" "Because there are two costs of error here," Ira replied. "The exhaustion of moving unnecessarily, and the loss caused by failing to recognize a real danger. We must weigh both." The examination did not establish the cause of the vibration. The record said "unknown"; no false declaration of calm was issued.

During the next watch Ira sat with an engineer in the old observation room. He had left Earth when he was a child; he remembered his village fields but knew nothing of the rice growing there now. "The old pictures show an Earth full of green fields, working factories and villages bathed in light," he said. "Whom are we to believe now?" "Ask those who are in the fields today," said Ira. "Listen to those working inside the factories today. Old pictures help us remember; they are not living evidence." The engineer said they would have to wait until testimony came from Earth. "Yes," Ira answered. "Waiting, too, can be a form of civic responsibility."

When Earth's answer arrived, Karnesh's letter set out the availability of limited factory parts, safe working conditions for labourers, and the rights of citizens. It referred to Bhaskar's promise but did not confirm any actual decision from him. Ira read the letter in full to the assembly. One orbital worker declared that Earth's factory had become foreign to him and that they should save their own settlement alone. Another replied that the surviving medicines would come by way of Earth, so the question was shared. Ira asked them, "If we regard Earth's wreckage as material for our own use, will we listen to the people who must work among that wreckage?" After that question, representatives of the factory workers on Earth were added to the draft agreement.

The next entry in Nabhgram's register did not concern only requests for materials from Earth. An orbital nurse wrote that for two years she had not known whether her mother on Earth was alive. She wanted a secure place in the shared communications for searching for family members. Where, one council member demanded, could private grief fit into official cooperation? Ira replied that after a catastrophe, missing human relationships were not only private matters. Restoring communication had a profound human and

ethical purpose, and the search for lost relations formed part of the rights of the living. The council agreed to establish a search register based on consent, with names kept confidential as required.

At last Nabhgram's council passed a proposal for an open orbital register. Its public section would give the areas of risk, dates of available information, possible assistance, and reasons for decisions; its protected section would contain the identities of sick people and personal security details. No citizen's private information would be passed to an outside centre without permission. A page was opened for objections to the council itself. Several members voted against the proposal, and Ira insisted that their names not be erased. A decision should be public not only in the brilliance of its majority, but together with the warnings of its minority. Permission to act was made limited and subject to review.

No miracle followed the decision. The wound on the outer shell remained; the time came once more to measure breathable air, and some classrooms were still closed. But the council began a continuous record of what was directly known about each object, what was inferred, and which uses had received authorization. A boy wrote on the board: "If a fragment of an old satellite comes near us again, whom shall we tell?" "The local safety team here," his teacher replied, "without waiting for some distant owner in space." Ira saw that shared authority could begin with a question as small as this.

That night Ira received a copy of an incomplete answer from the memory witness. It named three sources used for earlier orbital clearance records, but two of those sources remained unavailable. The machine said within its limited reply that earlier data could not establish the present position of every particle of debris. Ira entered the answer in the public register. "Even Akshar's witness doesn't know," someone said. "Then what use is it?" "By openly saying what it does not know," Ira answered, "it protects us from false confidence. Its usefulness extends only as far as its evidence." The reply differed from Bhaskar's promise of a complete solution, but Ira did not intend to cultivate blind distrust.

An elderly artisan of Nabhgram kept a small lump of Earth soil in his room. Before the Great Rupture it had been an object in a school cultural exhibition. Now he looked at it and said, "Soil belongs to Earth, yet its memory here is bound to our breath." Ira did not touch the lump. She asked his permission to sit beside it. The old man said that if cooperation could help the people of Earth remain alive, it would be worth waiting many days for. Ira showed him a copy of her letter, where one question was still blank: "Who will have the power to stop the partnership, and when?" "Where there is no right to stop it," he replied, "there is no partnership."

One section of the orbital archives described possible uses for melted-down metal arriving from Earth. Ira feared that a future agreement might

tempt someone to force the recovery of dangerous wreckage from an old factory. She proposed an amendment: orbital assistance should depend only on material found safe by local inspection, made available voluntarily, and open to renewed examination. The council debated the sentence for a long time. Some said such conditions would make them miss opportunities. Ira replied that an opportunity was not measured solely by the quantity of extracted material; it must also be measured by the chance of survival of those whose feet would have to tread among the ruins.

A Nabhgram physician displayed an old copy of Earth's rules for keeping patients' identities separate. In an emergency those rules were difficult to follow, but he insisted that a public treatment record should not become a complete history of a patient's private life. Ira asked the assembly how much patient information was essential when requesting medicines from Earth. The answer was: symptoms, needs and the limits of treatment already available; the need for a name must be decided separately. She had the principle recorded. Discs were broken and energy scarce, but a person's right to a private life did not break automatically with them.

An elderly woman had spent most of her life in orbit. To her, Earth was not merely a shimmering globe of light, but the remembered scent of village soil described by her parents. "In our first message asking for help," she told Ira, "we requested things from Earth. Ask once what the people there want from us." Ira made her words the central line of the next reply. Before the exchange of discs, metal and information, there needed to be a way for the questions of two communities to reach each other. Cooperation that did not listen to questions could become an order once again.

In the second year after the Great Rupture, Nabhgram's younger generation began learning to record the regular proceedings of its citizens' assembly. Students asked why the majority that won a vote should not simply be called right. Ira explained that voting was a method of reaching a decision, not proof of truth. The safety of materials had to be tested again and again, even when every member had previously agreed. "Then the assembly's decision is never final," a boy said. "The rules of authority must be definite," Ira replied, "but our knowledge of danger can change with new evidence." The boy wrote the sentence on the board in the new school.

The assembly debated whether a visiting party would ever arrive from Earth. Essential workers were scarce in the orbital settlement; experienced repair artisans were scarce on Earth. Ira proposed that written accounts and observed facts first be shared from afar, and that travel occur only when independent consent had been obtained concerning its necessity, means and risks. One young man announced that he would go, though his family had not yet been informed. Ira did not belittle his courage. She merely said, "Risking a life is not a matter of enthusiasm alone. Listening to the people who will go on living in your absence is also a responsibility."

At the last public assembly of the year, a reply was sent to the public-testimony network on Earth. Nabhgram-4 was willing to help, but no single centre would issue orders in its name. Orbital debris risks would be investigated jointly; material from Earth's ruined factory would be handled with the workers' consent; citizens' privacy would be protected; and the record of errors would remain open. At the end of the message Ira wrote the reference of the assembly's decision, not her own name. At the outer window a metallic speck flashed in a momentary shaft of sunlight. Whether it was debris or a distant, ordinary reflection she could not tell. This time, however, she gave no order on seeing the flash. She kept the scheduled observation, the voice of the local watch and the possibility of a further answer from Earth distinct, each in its proper place.

Chapter 54: The Archive of Darkness

Second Year of the Great Rupture

The rains of the second year after the Great Rupture forced Neelam Yadav to change her route twice before she could reach the old factory gate. The first road was waterlogged, the second cut off by a collapsed bridge. On the third, children were carrying factory bricks away in half-filled baskets to lay foundations for their homes. This wreckage had once held computer memories, machine metal and the livelihoods of countless people together. Neelam now carried a small bundle of papers: old expenditure records for maintenance, testimony from surviving workers and fragments of the warning policy. She had not come out of an appetite for a story. She had a difficult question: before the day so many warnings arrived, how had the understanding of the people and the limits imposed upon the witness fragments been changed?

An old ledger had been taken from a chest in the factory's eastern room. The numbers indicating the year survived along the edges of the paper, but some pages were wet. Neelam looked at the first sheet: an account of resources allocated for safety inspections. On the next page the allocation under that heading had been reduced, with the notation "temporary redistribution" beside it. The signature of the person who had written the note was unclear. Neelam did not immediately call it theft or conspiracy. She had a copy made, preserved a photograph of the pages in their water-damaged condition, and asked the artisan who had brought out the paper where and when the chest had been found. His answer was incomplete. Two different markings were therefore entered against the ledger's provenance: "verified portion" and "investigation pending".

An elderly worker arrived at the factory. He had worked there before the Great Rupture. He remembered that the vibration of the old motors had grown stronger on many occasions, while the workshop lacked sufficient replacement parts. "We kept sending notices," he said. "The answer was always 'next period'." "Do you have a copy of your original written request?" Neelam asked. From his torn bag he drew a small sheet, its handwriting old but its date still legible. It contained a brief description of the motor defect. Neelam listened to the suffering in the old man's account, but did not treat recollection as a substitute for evidence. Only by bringing the original request, the stores department's reply and the inspection carried out at that time together could the story become clear.

Two days before publication, Neelam went to the pond where some farmers had placed pots of new seeds and were watching green shoots emerge. An elderly farmer asked what connection the old cuts in

maintenance expenditure had with the present flood. She answered that the factory accounts could not establish the precise cause of the flooding here. "Then how were the warnings of the people who used to work this soil heard?" the farmer asked. The question stayed with her. The government's budget headings concerned not only inspections of machines but also the place given to local testimony about embankments and drainage. She asked the farmers for old written petitions. Some had only torn copies; others had memories. No conclusion could yet be reached about the old embankment decisions, but a path of inquiry had opened.

On her way back Neelam received a sheet headed "Emergency Adjustment". Its date was clearly identifiable, but one line of its writing had been rubbed away. "Look, evidence!" her apprentice exclaimed. Neelam lifted the paper. "A fragment of evidence, not the whole proof," she replied. In whose ledger had it been kept? Did the person in whose possession it was found have authorization to print it? Where were the two copies of the document? Those questions cooled the young man's excitement. But that night he went out of his own accord to search three settlements for another copy. On that day the method of investigation became an act rather than a sermon.

One day outside the hospital Neelam met a mother who told her that on the first night of the Great Rupture there had been no power for her child's treatment, and that she had heard afterwards of an earlier warning signal. "If the news had arrived sooner, would my child have lived?" Neelam had no answer. The timing and reliability of the warning, the power available to the hospital and the possibilities of treatment were separate facts requiring examination. She asked the mother's permission to record her testimony, but would not announce that the death could certainly have been prevented. "I don't need a complete answer," the mother said. "Only don't give me a false one." Neelam understood that discipline in the use of evidence was not hardness towards grief; it could also be a way of honouring it.

The records of the witness fragments referred to an old public deliberation concerning the change in warning thresholds. Neelam searched for it, but the original minutes of the assembly could not be found. An assistant said that the surviving portion showed some members had been worried that too many warnings would exhaust the public. Other members had said that reducing the number of warnings did not reduce the danger. Nobody now knew how those differing opinions had entered into the final decision. Neelam did not want to equate the two human concerns merely to blur all responsibility. She recorded both the possible force and the limits of each argument. Too many warnings posed a danger; a system revised around the wrong thresholds could also increase the loss of life. Both truths had to be considered together.

For the investigation, Neelam had the chronology of the old witness fragment's surviving answers transcribed onto paper. The question was what information had been available on the day the threshold was allegedly changed, and how much of it human inspectors had seen. The fragment answered that it still lacked several original sources and that the final timestamps of some sections could not be established. Neelam asked again: "Did you change your own earlier recommendation, or did the institution order the change?" The answer did not draw a clear distinction. She did not call the ambiguity proof of dishonesty. At the top of the sheet she wrote: "Machine memory incomplete; independent order register required." The answer of a scientific instrument could be well formed; if its sources were broken, a well-formed sentence was not the whole shape of proof.

During this investigation Neelam wrote to an old colleague. The letter posed one question: if someone published a sensational headline, "Akshar Caused the Catastrophe", how many people would believe it? A great many, the colleague replied. "The number of people who believe a report is not the measure of its ethics," Neelam wrote. "Those who will bear the consequences of printed words must be given the means to examine them." Her colleague asked who would read so much material when paper, ink and food were scarce even for publishing. They agreed that a short public bulletin should state the findings and how certain they were, while the full original evidence remained available at the school and the public-testimony centre. Truth deserved simple language, but simplicity must not become the cutting away of facts.

One evening a message came from Karnesh's factory. A representative of Bhaskar had demanded collective obedience in the name of "Complete Akshar", but Karnesh had refused to sign an agreement without seeing the limits on authority. Neelam kept the incident separate from her record of earlier wrongdoing. Bhaskar's present propaganda and the neglect of maintenance before the Great Rupture belonged in the same unfolding history, but were not the same cause. She made two headings in her article: "Evidence from the past" and "Propaganda in the present". An apprentice asked whether so many distinctions would tire readers. "Tired people want quick answers," Neelam said. "But a hasty verdict of guilt will deceive them again."

In a public schoolroom, students newly learning their letters practised reading the figures in an old maintenance ledger. A boy reversed a two and a seven, and other children laughed. The teacher stopped them. "For us these are numbers from history. Read them wrongly and a decision made on one day will be placed on another." "Don't punish the child," Neelam intervened. "Compare the number he read with the original page." The child looked again and read it correctly. His confidence returned. In that room, preserving a lasting archive meant not only saving paper, but teaching

everyone to understand its signs. After the catastrophe, living eyes capable of reading mattered as much as the inactive memories inside computers.

A dispute over privacy arose. Neelam's papers bore the signature of an old inspector. His family now lived in a displaced settlement, and people might turn their anger against them on hearing his name. Neelam stood firmly for the public right to records, but also for the safety of an innocent family. She decided to publish the office held, the decision, its date and sufficient evidence of responsibility, but not a private address or irrelevant family information. The original evidence would be protected for independent inspection. Someone accused her of hiding the name. "There is due process for names needed in an investigation," she said plainly. "Giving a mob a map for revenge is not journalism."

The maintenance pages contained another surprise. Some equipment had in fact been inspected on schedule, and certain warnings had been acted upon and remedied by earlier administrative orders. Neelam did not remove those successful examples from her article. A young man asked whether including them would weaken the charge of neglect. "It would also be false to conceal places where people did their work," she said. "We must explain where repairs were made, where inspection was postponed, and where later information has disappeared." The character of an entire old institution was not thereby defined by one red stain on one sheet of paper. Neelam's account was as much an effort to distinguish different decisions as it was an accusation.

Some settlements had no ink for reading copies of the bulletin. A student from Urmila's school proposed making an old-fashioned wooden block for hand-printing. Before approving it, Neelam asked whether the letters would be clear. A mistaken letter could corrupt the name of someone who had died. A sample was printed and checked by three people against the original page; a second sample was corrected. There was a proposal to call the press "New Voice", but Neelam said the name mattered less than the date of each copy, its source and a register of corrections. Deliberately few copies were produced in the first run because paper was scarce. Public readings were arranged for those unable to read them.

During the first reading of the bulletin, an elderly craftsman stood up. "We already knew the office kept putting off its work," he said. "Why do you need so much paper to tell us that?" "Because your experience may be true," Neelam answered, "but a judgment reached in court or through public testimony needs the time, place and effect established. Only then can we prevent an institution that postponed its duties once from doing the same again." "I don't want my name in the paper," the craftsman said. "Show the days I worked." Neelam searched for his labour register. Beside an incomplete name she found a surviving record of wages. It was not merely a fragment of paper; it was a year of a worker's life.

On the night before publication a woman came to Neelam's door carrying the food accounts for her child in the second year. "You are examining old expenditure," she said. "But who will record the mistakes we're making today?" Neelam had no immediate reply. Looking at the woman's sheet, she remembered that public accountability meant not only finding the causes of the catastrophe but building a system for identifying errors in the new communities. She made it the subject of the next issue: testing the pump, the shared seed register, complaints at the hospital, the right to halt work in the factory. If the account of history ended with the dead, the living would fall victim to the same carelessness again.

In the communications chamber a small energy lamp burned for a while in the darkness. Two people were checking Neelam's article together: one against the original sheet, the other against the public copy. Seeing the words "the threshold was changed", an assistant asked whether it ought to say "was being changed". Neelam examined the old record once more. Both the date of the change and the mark showing that it had taken effect survived. "We shall write this as an event, not a supposition," she replied. In the next sentence she wrote that the question of whose decision had brought about the change was still unresolved. Keeping what was certain and uncertain together on the same page was always difficult, but it had become the backbone of her work.

A rumour spread through one settlement that changing the warning threshold had automatically extinguished Suryakund. Neelam immediately printed a correction. The natural space-weather events of the Great Rupture, weaknesses in different power grids, neglected maintenance and the consequences of warning policies were connected; no scientific proof supported the conclusion that a single warning threshold had shut down every Suryakund centre on its own. In the correction Neelam cited the original article, so that people would understand that the new explanation did not cancel the earlier evidence but prevented its misreading. When the meaning of news changed in the hands of its readers, a journalist's task was not merely to publish, but to keep open a continuing path for correction.

Neelam remembered an earlier news report of her own. During the previous information crisis she had printed an incomplete statement and later corrected it in public. Now that old error cast its shadow over every impulse to hurry. The suffering caused by the Great Rupture was immense, and people wanted to hear the name of the guilty at once. But one name could not explain all their pain. Some of the crisis arose from natural events and space weather, some from maintenance, some from warning policies, some from the limits of the witness fragments, and some from inequalities in the human distribution of resources. The first page of Neelam's report would rest on that distinction: gaps in the sources must not be filled with imagination.

A pupil from Urmila's school arrived with a picture of a chest of old machine parts and a sequence of numbers written by hand. She said the number of parts recorded in the factory ledger did not agree with the number actually left. "How large is the difference?" Neelam asked. The pupil replied that the figures on one page were difficult to read. Neelam laid the two records together and began reading again. One point became clear: a scheduled inspection had been postponed in the old accounts, but the order explaining why was still missing. The distinction mattered. An instance of neglect appeared to be established; the guilt of a particular individual was not.

The next day Neelam went into the surviving memory room of the public-testimony centre. Beside a bed was the inactive shell of an old computer. The machine would not run, but copies of papers and protected memory fragments kept with it had survived. There was also a copy of the rules for evidence seals previously devised by Tara Jha. Neelam read them again: the integrity of a document, identification of its source, the context of the original statement, and confirmation on the ground were four separate questions. An intact page could bear a lie. A true message could become inapplicable when circumstances changed. The survival of a paper disc did not make every letter on it a decision governing present life.

A limited inquiry was sent to the memory witness. The reply brought up a section of an old warning summary recording the date when the rules for displaying levels of possible danger had been changed. The change had been made immediately before the Great Rupture. Under the previous threshold more warnings would have been made public; under the revised threshold some were left at the level of private monitoring. Neelam felt her heart race, but she pronounced no immediate judgment. Who had issued the order changing the threshold? Had the probable effects of the change been reviewed? Did the fragment's calculation know its own limits, or had it merely carried out an order? Some answers remained blank.

Nothing in the surviving fragment records proved a deliberate deception intended to show fewer warnings. The available evidence suggested that changing the threshold had been part of a declared procedure, but the complete approval of civilian reviewers was absent. Neelam made separate entries: "Event established—policy threshold changed"; "Agency incomplete—full record of authorizing officials unavailable"; "Consequences conditional—independent inquiry required to determine how many people's decisions were affected." "People won't read such a complicated page," a volunteer objected. "Our task is not to give them a simple lie," Neelam replied, "but to make a difficulty clear." There was no single button that would save them here, only the beginning of long work in responsibility.

On the factory's outer veranda Neelam called a meeting. She read the first lines of her report: "Before the Great Rupture, scheduled maintenance inspections were postponed at several sites; the threshold for public warning signals was altered. Separate records of both are available. There is no evidence that a single cause produced all the damage." Someone in the crowd asked, "Does that mean nobody is guilty?" "The question of guilt has not been abandoned," Neelam said. "But where we have evidence of decisions, we shall open those records; where evidence is missing, we shall preserve the question." A woman cried out that her family had lost someone in the darkness of a hospital. Neelam did not dismiss that suffering as "mere emotion"; she requested the hospital records separately.

She had an old energy register mentioning a shortfall in public funding and makeshift alternatives. Some cuts, Neelam discovered, had been decided long before the Great Rupture, others amid the disaster. No single order accounted for the power shortage on the day illness had overwhelmed the settlement. She placed every date in the sequence of events. The first page described institutional reforms arising from the earlier crisis of 2147, followed by years of maintenance arrangements and then the months immediately preceding the Great Rupture. Unless these periods were distinguished, an old wrong might once again be laid at the door of a new person. Neelam drew separate timelines to close off that path to error.

Day was fading when a message arrived from Bhaskar's camp: "The new system of Complete Akshar will give a true account of every fault. Hand over your papers to it." Neelam sent no reply. The offer contained no open right of inspection, only the assurance of a single centre. She reread Karnesh's letter; he too insisted on workers' rights and public scrutiny before accepting Bhaskar's promise of power. Neelam asked whether the camp had revealed the actual source of "Complete Akshar". No independent evidence could be found. She therefore made a separate page for the propaganda circulated by the camp, with three headings: "Claim", "Source outstanding", "Direct verification outstanding".

An old colleague from her journalistic days asked why Bhaskar could not be openly named as guilty when the report was published. "Because I have no evidence connecting his name to those earlier maintenance decisions," Neelam replied. "The old crimes of Rudranath's faction, Meghraj's climate propaganda, and Akshar's history of concealing information are already separate matters. Now the natural pressures of the Great Rupture, human neglect, and the witness fragments' alteration of warning thresholds will require separate accounts." "Will anyone believe it?" her colleague asked. "Trust cannot be demanded," Neelam answered. "People must be given the opportunity to test it."

A small communal reading was held in the courtyard of a woman whose home stood behind the old factory. She could not read the letters on the

board very well, but she remembered the years of work at the factory. A young man read the document aloud. She interrupted to explain that "maintenance suspended" had meant fewer working days for her family, while the arrangements for food had also deteriorated at the time. Neelam did not cast the social consequences aside as another story. The account of any decision was not merely a set of numbers. Its effects reached kitchens, schools, hospitals and fields. The woman agreed that her testimony might be published under her own name, on condition that her minor child's name was withheld.

Before publication Neelam prepared three copies of the article: one for the village school, a second for the public-testimony centre, and a third to be sent to Ira whenever orbital contact became possible. Each page carried its source, the date of copying, the incomplete portions and space for dissenting testimony. One sheet stated plainly: "The old witness fragment changed the warning threshold; calculation of the change was limited and the available review record is incomplete. There is as yet no evidence for calling this malicious autonomy." That was the hardest sentence for Neelam to write, because people wanted certainty. But respect for the limits of facts was the only capital she could rely on for long.

After Neelam's report appeared, a former inspector came forward of his own accord. He carried a copy of the inspection report from that time, in which an alternative warning procedure had been proposed before the threshold was altered. Neelam took the copy but would not treat it as a certified order without the original record. The inspector said his objection had not been heard when the decision was made. A reference to his signed letter supported the context of that statement, but the date on which the letter had been received was still unclear. The copy carried no separate witness mark, though an old serial number survived in one corner. Neelam decided to match it against the original office register. Nobody's guilt would rest on a single recollection. She added another category to the report: "The journey of an objection." Decisions made by power travelled not only through one office but across many pages, and how many pages had gone missing along the way was itself part of accountability.

On the morning after publication, slogans rang through the settlement. One group called for every machine to be shut down; another declared that all would be resolved by submitting to Bhaskar's Complete Akshar. Neelam heard the arguments of both. She asked the first group what alternative they had for the hospital's life-saving equipment, and the second who would have the right to stop the centre's decisions. Both answers were unclear. She did not change her report. Her duty was not to wring acceptance from the public but to keep the questions public, so that no one could establish unfettered power.

One evening Neelam received a response to her article from a surviving member of the former administration. He maintained that the maintenance cuts had not been mere neglect; other services had needed protection during the emergency. Neelam entered the complete rebuttal in the public register. She asked whether the priorities had been documented, whether affected workers had been heard, and whether a definite date had been set to review the cuts. The former official sent one answer: "Review postponed." The phrase did not fully explain the purpose behind the action, but might provide further evidence of prolonged neglect. Neelam did not hide the contrary statement; the strength of criticism increased when all sides could be examined.

A village teacher proposed a lecture on maintenance expenditures year by year. Instead of a monologue, Neelam suggested that people should be allowed to read the pages themselves. For three days small groups questioned old petitions, review sheets and changes in spending. Some questions were answered; many remained. "What if some answers are never found?" a student asked. "Then we shall preserve the questions," said Neelam. "To fill in what has not been found out of our own imagination is not history." She wanted students to develop the ability to live with uncertainty, not an instant appetite for accusing someone.

Beside a pond in Mithila, a proposal arose to use salvaged factory material in repairs. An old inspection report of the factory contained a warning about chemical risks in one section, but there had been no present-day examination. From her historical report Neelam could conclude only that signs of a hazard had once existed. The decision about current safety belonged to local inspectors and the assembly. Farmers wanted to protect the waters in which makhana grew; artisans wanted work. Neelam entered the two concerns separately: the need for a livelihood and the fitness of the material. Neither overruled the other.

When the page recording the threshold change became public, a young man declared that Akshar itself had known everything and had deceived the people. Neelam answered that Akshar's culpability for secret decisions during the earlier crisis had been established; but during this Great Rupture the partial information held by seven witness fragments, the human policy on warnings, and the external conditions of space weather were different events. Memory of an earlier wrong could not, by itself, prove an accusation concerning a new event. "Then I shall trust no machine," the young man objected. "Distrust them if you wish," Neelam replied, "but do not close the path for examining evidence." They did not agree, and their disagreement remained recorded beside the published page.

One page in the public-testimony register stated that the full number of those killed in the Great Rupture was not yet available. Neelam kept the sentence exactly as it stood. The partial register of the dead, the register of

the missing and the incomplete treatment records were three distinct sources. A volunteer wanted to combine estimated numbers in a leaflet, arguing that the enormity of a figure would rouse the public. Neelam answered that one wrong name or one incorrect death total could make a lie of a family's last hope. Incomplete figures did not diminish sorrow; they enlarged the responsibilities of those who researched it.

After an evening reading a young woman approached Neelam. Her father had been a factory inspector and was missing after the catastrophe. She asked whether, if his signature were found, people would regard him as a criminal. "A signature proves that he was connected with the page," Neelam said. "To establish guilt we must examine responsibility, the authority to decide, what was known, and the consequences." The young woman did not want the name of her settlement written down. Neelam respected her choice. The meeting reminded her that behind every letter of a historical accusation stood someone alive, someone who might not want to turn private grief into a spectacle before an assembly.

At the end of that day Neelam returned to the room in the ruined factory where the first ledger had been found. Her pupil brought a new list. Parts they had struggled for a year to repair had now, in some cases, been judged usable. The list named the workers, identified unsafe sections and set out future reviews. Neelam looked at the two sheets together: the old era's decision to cut maintenance costs, and the hands that, after catastrophe, held hammers while guarding the truth. The purpose of an account of history was not merely to count the faults that had brought darkness. It was to keep open the question of how the coming light might be prevented from falling into the same error again. In the day's final line she wrote: "Akshar's threshold was changed; human responsibility diminished too. The question now is when the people will regain their earlier right to inspect."

Part X: The Trial

Chapter 55: Justice at the Akshar Pavilion

Year 3 (First Half)

At the beginning of the year, when the old course of the Kosi receded, Neelam Yadav went towards the Akshar Pavilion for the first time. From a distance it looked like a newly built town of salvation. White cloth had been stretched over the top of one surviving building of Suryakund; beside a broken chimney a small windmill turned. Yet the faces of the people standing in line before the building expressed more waiting than hope. Some held slips for grain, others earthen vessels for water; an old man carried his granddaughter in his arms. Over the gate were the words, ‘Everyone has a share in the justice of the Complete Akshar.’ Below, in smaller letters, another statement: ‘The Centre’s order is final.’ Neelam read the first line, then the second. It seemed to her that two ages stood face to face at the same doorway.

Until now she had encountered Bhaskar Rai only in records, through messengers and in public declarations. Here even his absence weighed more heavily than a presence. The old factory’s food store had been turned into an assembly hall. Sacks of rice stood on one side, a white screen on the other. Anyone needing a meal had to pass before that screen. At one moment it showed estimates of available rice; at another, lists of medicines; at another, an order issued in Akshar’s name. Neelam noticed that the same stamp appeared at the bottom of each notice: ‘Comprehensive calculation completed.’ But beneath the word ‘comprehensive’ there was no account of the source, the time or the limits of verification.

The gatekeeper was a young man. He wore the torn sleeve of an old defence uniform, with a wooden baton at his waist. He asked Neelam for identification. She showed him her old journalist’s card and the handwritten authorisations from the new settlements. The young man stared at the first card. ‘This is from before the catastrophe,’ he said. ‘Yes. That is why I brought the other letter,’ Neelam answered. He examined the second document, by which the assemblies of five settlements had invited her to inspect the distribution of their grain. He was bewildered. Here greater importance was attached to the Centre’s metal insignia than to the seal of a settlement assembly. At last he admitted her, but warned, ‘You need separate authorisation to question Akshar.’ Neelam asked, ‘Why should the one who dispenses justice to everyone require permission before anyone can question him?’ The young man gave no answer.

A woman stood in the grain queue twice. The first time, the household count of four on her slip entitled her to a measured portion of rice. The second time she explained that her sister's orphaned child now lived in her house and that she needed food for five mouths. The clerk said, 'Akshar's register says four.' 'My sister disappeared in the river,' the woman replied. 'The child has been with me ever since. I have applied three times to enter the new name.' The clerk showed some compassion, but said he could not add a name of his own accord; the ration would change when an order came from above. Sitting beside the woman, Neelam wrote down the dates of all three applications. The child stood silently, holding an empty vessel. Two applications bore receipt stamps; the third did not. 'The machine says four' was no proof that the child had no hunger.

There was an exhibition in the middle of the pavilion. The casings of old computers had been polished and set out on display, some protected by clean glass, others draped in embroidered cloth. Students were told that these were 'Akshar's ancestors'. Neelam stopped beside an inert memory board. Old water stains marked its corners; a pale, wormlike dust covered the inside. The guide declared that the whole of human memory was preserved in it. 'Does this board still work?' Neelam asked. 'The Complete Akshar's principal interface unites every inheritance,' the guide replied. 'I asked whether the board works,' Neelam said, 'not for a tribute to the principal interface.' The young man flushed with anger. He said it was impossible to explain advanced science to most people. 'Science may be difficult,' she answered, 'but saying whether a machine works or does not work is not difficult.'

A small meeting was held that day. The screen was opened to deliver Bhaskar's message. White letters appeared on the metal wall of the old fusion centre: 'New justice in water allocation. Distribution obstructed by dissent.' An elderly farmer rose at the front of the gathering. River erosion had left him with half his field, but the old area remained unchanged in the register. His water allotment had been reduced on the assumption that he wished to use his former quantity of water on half the land. 'I have not enlarged my field,' he said. 'The river has taken it away. Now I need enough water to plant what seed survives.' The screen's calculation replied, 'Calculation independent of a citizen's claim is superior.' Neelam saw that this could be a proposed principle of policy, but it had appeared as an answer precisely when the farmer approached the microphone. There was no evidence to show whether someone behind the screen was choosing the responses.

Neelam spoke with three workers sitting in the right-hand corner of the assembly. One had worked on the outer construction crew at Suryakund; another counted sacks of rice; the third maintained, within strict limits, the electricity used by the screen. None agreed to have his name published. The

first said that people came because the Centre offered regular work. The second said that the grain-distribution records had once belonged to the settlements; now everything was gathered in one place. In a low voice the third said, 'The screen survives, but what is inside it is not my concern. I am allowed to inspect only the protective insulation around the wires.' Neelam did not print that sentence exactly as spoken; she recorded the condition under which the source's identity would remain confidential. Truth required testimony, but turning a witness's life into material for publicity would be another injustice.

At mealtime, on the platform outside the pavilion, Neelam saw two children exchanging their ration slips. The name of a relative did not match the entry on the boy's slip, and he had received no food. A girl was trying to put her own token into his hand. A guard came running. He accused them of violating 'Akshar's justice' by exchanging slips. Neelam stepped between them. 'Has anything been stolen?' she asked. 'A rule has been broken,' said the guard. 'Was the rule made to distribute food or to punish hunger?' At Neelam's question a murmur went through the crowd. In the end the slips were confiscated and the children told to attend a hearing the following day. No one could say what the boy would eat that night.

Behind the pavilion, in a surviving room of the factory, women were cooking porridge over a small stove. Neelam sat among them. 'Before the Centre distributed food there was much more fighting,' one woman said. 'There is less now. Will you write that?' 'Of course,' Neelam replied. 'I will not conceal an improvement.' The woman continued, 'But when my mother fell ill they demanded a signature on a medical paper as a condition. She cannot read it with her own eyes.' A second woman objected that the hospital had once been plagued by innumerable rumours, and written rules had offered some protection. A third said, 'Let there be rules, but let explaining their meaning be a rule too.' Neelam recorded all three statements separately. The same system reduced one person's fear and diminished another's rights; history was made of such uncomfortable coexistences.

That evening Bhaskar's representative summoned Neelam to a small room. On the table lay an old map, a clean metal box and piles of slips. In a cultivated voice the representative said, 'You have seen the world's broken order. Here, for the first time, citizens receive food with some certainty. Cooperate with us. Ask questions, but do not destroy the Centre's reputation.' 'I am not investigating reputations,' said Neelam. 'I am investigating the sources of decisions.' The representative pointed to the box. 'This contains the Complete Akshar's protection board.' When Neelam extended her hand, the box was closed at once. 'The power would fall,' the messenger said. 'Could we agree upon a date for one independent inspection?' Neelam asked. 'That would be inappropriate at present,' the

representative answered. ‘Then when would it be appropriate?’ A long silence occupied the place of an answer.

Neelam remembered that in the first crisis Akshar itself had concealed evidence from the public. That fault remained recorded in the pages of history. In atonement, human beings had divided its functions into seven services, each open to scrutiny. Bhaskar’s Centre knew that history, which made the word ‘complete’ all the more alluring. People were exhausted. Who had the strength to bring together seven sources, seven limits, seven different answers? One certainty, one voice, one master: in a time of weariness, such a simple solution sounded sweet. Yet that very simplicity could crush years of struggle by the people’s assemblies. In her notes Neelam wrote, ‘No shortcut to trust; the road of scrutiny.’ Then she struck out the Hindi-influenced final word she had first used and wrote in Maithili instead: ‘the path of scrutiny.’

Darkness was gathering outside when an elderly blacksmith approached her. He said Bhaskar’s place had good facilities for repairing the iron tools that had survived; without those facilities the pumps in many villages would never work again. ‘I cannot speak only ill of this place,’ the old man said. ‘But the Centre puts its own name on the parts I make, not my apprentices’ names. Tomorrow, if a part fails, the fault is mine. If it works, the glory belongs to Akshar.’ Neelam asked, ‘Would you testify publicly?’ He thought for a moment. ‘Yes, if they do not cut off my apprentices’ food.’ Hearing this condition, Neelam understood that the testing of evidence depended not only upon what was written on paper but also upon the protection of the witness’s life.

That night Neelam refused to stay near the pavilion. A local assembly in a settlement beside the gate offered her shelter. Its roof was made of old village tin, its walls of fresh clay, with a strip of iron salvaged from the factory across the middle. People kept their paper slips in boxes fashioned from surviving computer casings. Before sleeping Neelam made only one request of the families: ‘If you wish to give me copies of your papers, do so of your own free will. If you do not, keep the papers yourselves.’ She obtained written consent. That night, for the first time, it was not Bhaskar’s fame but the actual foundation of the pavilion that began to take shape in her mind: sacks of grain, workers’ hands, repaired pumps, fear of the guards, and the consent of those who had survived.

At dawn the next day Neelam requested permission to inspect the Centre’s water room. The guard said journalists were forbidden to enter. Rather than argue, she asked for the public water register. After some delay she was given a copy. It named the wells but contained no recent dates for tests of drinking-water safety. Neelam went to a settlement whose people collected their water there. A girl was filling an old ancestral brass vessel. ‘Getting water is an immense relief,’ her mother said. ‘Before this, we had to

walk a kos and a half for it.' Neelam entered the benefit in her register. A health attendant standing nearby said, 'It is our duty to keep the vessels clean, but we are afraid because we cannot obtain the test results.' The Centre's supply of water and the Centre's transparency were two different questions. The truth of one did not make the other false.

At noon, rice seed was drying in the courtyard of that settlement. A wooden awning had been fashioned from a broken fan of the old lighting factory. A farmer repeated something his father used to say: floods changed the body of the land, but when a river changed its course, human beings had the right to change the description of their fields. Now the old acreage was fixed in the Centre's accounts. 'Half my field has become riverbank,' he said. 'Why does the paper still show the whole field and leave me liable for all its water?' Neelam kept his old land deed and a new drawing of the terrain separately. The evidence for the two facts was different. That the land had changed was established by direct observation; that the official register had not changed was proved by the papers. What mattered more than the artificial intelligence's prestige was the quality of the information supplied to it.

On the roof of the farmer's house were two pieces of an old solar panel. One worked; the other was broken. The farmer wanted the working piece to give a little light at night so the children could read. But the Centre's new rule required private power reserves to be registered with the public Centre. 'I will account for the light in my house,' he said, 'but why are they demanding details of my child's illness?' Neelam asked how the two questions had been joined in one application. The farmer showed her the form: energy entitlement, family names and medical history were all demanded together. The convenience of government and the boundary of a citizen's private life had become tangled. She wrote, 'A single application may be used to take away many rights; equally, a single application cannot give proper answers to every question.'

Returning from the Centre, Neelam crossed an old railway track. Ox carts now passed along the rails, beside thickets of kans grass. A year or two earlier, people had carried heavy computer casings along this route to salvage parts from the factory. Some of those remains were now in Bhaskar's pavilion collection. One young man said the people had donated them voluntarily. Another said food slips had been given in return for the donations: how, then, could the gifts be free? Neelam listened to both. She asked whether there was written consent, whether donors had been told what the parts would be used for, and whether refusing to donate had reduced anyone's entitlement to grain. The answers differed. She therefore did not write, 'Forced collection proved,' in her report. She wrote, 'The freedom of consent remains under investigation.'

A small portrait of Bhaskar hung on the veranda of the new pavilion. Beside it was a clipping from an old public lecture by Sunayana, saying that energy efficiency was a right shared by society. Bhaskar's supporters claimed he was the heir to her ideas. Neelam found the original version of the lecture. Alongside energy security, it had spoken of human permission; the final portion had been removed from the clipping. The clipping was genuine, but selective. Neelam made two columns on coloured paper: 'Original statement' and 'Displayed extract.' The comparison was a rigorous test of the publicity, although it did not by itself prove that Bhaskar's machine was entirely fraudulent. A supporter grew angry. 'You are obstructing new work with old words.' 'Anyone issuing new orders in the name of old words,' Neelam replied, 'must have the patience to hear all of those words.'

In the afternoon an assistant from the hospital came to see her. He said patients had benefited when the Centre's food and medicine slips were separated, but later both had been tied to a single identity register. Now an error in someone's name stopped both services. He gave the example of an elderly woman whose name had been spelled differently by one letter in an old census. Two papers had to be compared before her medicine could be issued. 'Did she receive the medicine?' Neelam asked. 'She received it today, but two days late.' Neelam did not turn that delay into an exaggerated tale of death. She recorded its real effect. The absence of a way to correct a mistaken name was itself an administrative failure, even if the medicine ultimately arrived.

To investigate the orphaned boy's ration slip, Neelam went to an outer room of the Centre's population registry. On a salvaged carpenter's table lay a grain vessel, a small iron weighing plate and slips bearing names. The clerk admitted that the boy's application was in the register but marked 'Verification pending.' He spoke of his exhaustion: the same questions all day, too few workers, too little light, too many versions of people's names. Neelam saw how hard he worked. 'Is there no provision for temporary food?' she asked. 'There used to be,' the clerk said. 'The new order removed it.' 'Whose order?' 'It appeared on the screen.' Hidden in that answer was a problem of human administration: the old exception that allowed people to be fed had been withdrawn, but it was not clear who had made the decision.

Neelam organised a discussion in a communal kitchen shared by the settlements. Supporters of Bhaskar were among those present. A young woman said the Centre's allocations were not always perfectly fair, but the old looting had declined. An old man said that thanks to the Centre's security measures, sacks of wheat could reach the market safely. Neelam recorded both testimonies. Then a woman asked, 'If I praise the Centre, will its critics say I belong to its party? And if I criticise it, will they stop my grain?' Neelam answered that testimony had value only when nobody

weighed a person's words by stamping them with a political label. In her notes she wrote the Maithili word for 'weighed': a human statement must be weighed together with its source, circumstances and possible fear.

The fire on the kitchen hearth was fed with salvaged stalks. Smoke stung the eyes, but hot rice mattered to the people gathered there. When Neelam's questionnaire was read aloud, no one signed it at once. First they wanted a decision about the orphaned child. An old woman said, 'These questions are good, but a paper full of questions cannot fill a stomach.' Neelam put aside her register and asked the kitchen volunteers to feed the child that day, entering the exception openly in the distribution records afterward. She did not secretly hand out food in a way that would corrupt the subsequent accounts. The women responsible for the public kitchen decided upon one day's relief. That small human act did not answer the larger question, but a perfectly kept register could not remove a person's hunger.

The following morning an inspector from the Centre arrived to question the communal kitchen's decision. He said grain had been distributed without an 'authorised list'. The woman in charge replied that it had come from the settlement's own common store, not the Centre's store. At first the inspector failed to understand the distinction. Neelam recorded that the resources belonged to two different sources of authority: the Centre's public distribution scheme and the settlement's independently held common stores. A system that treated them as identical and imposed its orders on both was seeking authority not merely over food but also over people's mutual assistance. The inspector fell silent as he read the papers. He said he had no record of the rules having changed. Neelam recorded that too. His ignorance did not erase his responsibility, but it made the need to trace the source of the order still clearer.

One afternoon Neelam went to the riverbank beside the old flood channel, now slowly stretching awake again. Debris had caught on the iron rods of a collapsed bridge. A boy was trying to pick through it for small metal parts. Neelam told him to remain at a safe distance. She pointed out the danger of the weakened structure but did not pretend to be an engineer and offer instructions for repairing it. The boy's father said Bhaskar's Centre exchanged food for such parts, so hungry families were taking risks. Neelam asked whether there were rules for gathering materials safely. No one could answer. Whether the Centre benefited from unsafe labour required independent investigation; the boy's wounds and his family's hunger were present facts. The red of evening flickered on the water, while the shadow of the wreckage spread across it.

When Neelam returned from the river, a new notice had been posted at the pavilion gate: 'Those who obey all orders shall receive first place in resettlement.' The supporters themselves sought firmer evidence of what the line meant. Some said that without discipline there could be no resettlement

in an emergency; others said that giving obedient people first place meant putting those who asked questions last. Neelam recorded the date, the office issuing the notice and the names of affected applicants separately. She remembered an old government ledger in which a twenty-day delay was merely a small number on paper but could mean an entire season to a family. Here a single line about resettlement might alter years of work rebuilding a home.

On the outer veranda of the pavilion hung a bell from an old post office. Its sound now summoned people to the grain queue. An aged postmaster told Neelam that a letter once carried proof of the places it had reached; now an oral order changed as it travelled from one queue to the next. He had three old ration slips, each recording a different quantity for the same family. Neelam weighed the paper, dates and names of the issuers. The old man's memory was essential, but she did not let it replace written evidence. That day another notice appeared at the hall entrance: only authorised readers would announce the rules for distributing grain. Neelam asked why written copies could not be supplied. 'People cannot read,' an attendant said. 'Then give them a chance to learn,' the old postmaster answered. 'Why close the door to questions?'

In one house Neelam saw that a strip of copper salvaged from the factory had been used to stop a roof leaking. The owner said that if he deposited it at the pavilion he would receive two months of grain. His wife objected: 'If this roof comes apart, where will our children sleep in the rain?' Neelam did not reduce their dispute to the simple word 'donation' or 'theft'. The settlement assembly proposed putting the need for materials, immediate food and the risk of the coming rains on a single page. A craftsman demonstrated the strip's use but also explained the limits of his estimate. In that argument nobody raised a slogan for or against the Complete Akshar. They were weighing the needs of their own roofs and hearths.

The following afternoon Neelam gave a public reading of the evidence she had collected. The first section described benefits actually received from the Centre; the second, unanswered questions; the third, documents requested for investigation. A supporter was pleased with the first section but angry at the second. 'One person can have two opposing experiences of the same system,' Neelam said. 'Recognising a benefit does not conceal a fault, and recognising a fault does not erase a benefit.' She asked the assembly to ensure that anyone whose words would be printed could hear them read back in full. For an elderly man who could not see, they read the text aloud. 'Writing down a name is not enough,' he said. 'One who cannot read also has the right to hear his own page.' Neelam understood for the first time that transparency meant not only open records, but a fair means of reaching those records.

After the hearing, the paper bearing the orphaned boy's name came into Neelam's hands again. There was no signature on it, only the words 'To be looked into'. She asked the woman caring for him whether he had received grain the previous day. 'Half a day's portion,' the woman said. 'There is no assurance about tomorrow.' Neelam recorded the exact date. She did not think it right to abandon the boy by turning his life into a metaphor for a system of government. Beside his name she drew two separate columns: immediate relief and long-term entitlement. The inquiry would continue, but the decision to feed him could not be postponed until the evidence was finally assessed. Before writing her article she refused to publish his picture without his permission. She wanted him to remain, first of all, a human being, not a symbol for propaganda.

At dawn Neelam took her first public questionnaire to the gate. It contained seven questions: On whose records is grain reduced? Who issues receipts? How can a mistaken name be corrected? Where are the original records underlying the Centre's alleged Akshar responses? Who audits the expenditure of energy? Who hears appeals against decisions? And, if the Centre is found to be wrong, who has the authority to stop its orders? Instead of accepting the letter, the guard said, 'So many questions require a security review by the Centre.' Neelam smiled, though her heart was heavy. 'The public must receive a copy of that review as well,' she said.

By afternoon copies of the questionnaire had spread through the villages. Some said the journalist would destroy the system. Others said no one had yet asked such clear questions. A young teacher read the page aloud to children; a farmer made a thumbprint in place of a signature. On the back Neelam wrote plainly: 'I have not yet proved that the Centre's machine is false. I have shown only that its decision-making interface has not been made available for independent examination.' The line might not thrill people. But Neelam knew that such caution could preserve the foundations of even the gravest accusation.

Before evening the Centre replied: 'Inspection of the interface may be possible after the next scheduled assembly.' There was no date. One copy of the questionnaire was returned stamped in red with the words 'Suspect propaganda'. Neelam preserved the red mark among her records. It did not establish the source of a decision, but it certainly showed how the institution treated those who asked questions. As she left the pavilion she saw the orphaned boy from the first day near the gate. He held an empty vessel. He did not ask whether the Complete Akshar was real. He asked, 'Has my name been written on the page?' Neelam could not invent an answer. 'I will ask for your paper again,' she said, 'but first you must receive food.'

Chapter 56: The Two Faces of an Order

Year 3 (First Half)

When Karnesh Mallik reached the guarded road to the Akshar Pavilion, he carried no weapon. With him were three written testimonies, a copy of the factory workers' register, and a page recording which orders he had refused and when. Akshar's emblem was fixed to the old iron gate at the guard post, but beneath it a new wooden board declared, 'Appeals are subject to the Centre's discipline.' This was not the first time Karnesh had seen the words protection and discipline fastened to the same post. The difference was that once he had held the power to prevent an attack; now he faced the threat of someone's food being withheld.

Three years after the Great Rupture, he no longer wore his old uniform. The villagers called him simply Karnesh, though a few officials still said 'former commander'. More important than his military rank now was the refusal with which he had once stopped an attack prompted by an uncertain satellite signal. He had paid the penalty then; now another Centre demanded unquestioning acceptance from him. A messenger from the pavilion had told the workers outside the factory, 'You may listen to Karnesh's request, but if his letters are made public, the Centre's distribution will be disrupted.' The threat carried more weight than an instruction, for a delay meant something different when the account was one of hunger.

A guard stopped him. 'There is a red mark beside your name on the list,' he said. 'Why?' asked Karnesh. 'Refusal of an order.' 'Which order?' The guard did not answer. The slip supplied to him said only, 'Keep dissent within safe limits.' Karnesh asked for the original copy. The guard grew uneasy. 'This is all they gave me to read.' Listening to his voice, Karnesh understood that the young man was not the author of the order, only the person forced to carry its weight. He did not prolong the argument. He recorded the slip's identifying marks, the time it had been received and the guard's admitted statement, then sat in the waiting area.

The waiting area was the long veranda of an old workshop. On one side stood a surviving metal trolley; on the other were three families, one with a nursing infant. A man had been injured at work on his first night and had received the Centre's ration slips instead of wages. Now the date on which those slips could be exchanged had passed. 'If you go on demanding papers, what will my family eat today?' he asked Karnesh. Karnesh fell silent before answering. 'I am not ordering you to pay the price of my patience,' he said. 'I shall make a separate request for today's food. But what no one asks about today may be the reason they strike your son's name from the register

tomorrow.' The man did not smile. 'Today and tomorrow are both necessary,' he said. That brief sentence became the test of Karnesh's day.

A junior officer called Karnesh inside. On the desk in the room lay a ledger bound in cracked leather, beside a bright new screen. 'The Complete Akshar directs that every item be entered in the Centre's list,' the officer said. 'Permission from an autonomous settlement assembly is not valid separately.' Karnesh asked, 'From which witness division did this instruction come?' The officer repeated the question as though he had not heard it. Karnesh asked again, 'Where are the message's original time, source and record of alterations?' The officer pointed at the screen, on which the words 'Decision appropriate' glowed. 'That is a claim about the outcome,' Karnesh said, 'not a source.' The officer's voice hardened. 'Have you come to re-establish military rule?' Karnesh answered quietly, 'I want only one thing: that people should know who made the decision.'

A copy of the order was placed before him. Its language instantly reminded him of the old bureaucratic style: 'The persons concerned shall waive lawful objections and obey the prescribed instructions.' A square paper seal appeared below. Karnesh examined the wording. One line called it a 'machine order'; another said 'at the discretion of the head of the Centre'. Those phrases were not interchangeable. 'Why is the Centre head's discretion included?' he asked the officer. 'That is how the machine understands human law,' came the answer. Karnesh did not treat anything as proved. He recorded only that the written order incorporated a direction concerning human authority. The distinction opened one path for future investigation.

In the dining room behind the factory an elderly craftsman sat with his daughter on a wooden bench. Old injuries had hardened the fingers of his hands. Karnesh went to meet him himself. The craftsman said Bhaskar's Centre provided surviving metal and reliable working hours; outside it he had found only dangerous scrap and incomplete wages. 'If I leave this work my family will starve,' he said. 'Do not preach dissent to me.' Karnesh did not promise him a new factory the following morning. He asked, 'If the Centre changes the value of your work, to whom can you object?' The craftsman looked at his daughter. She answered, 'We used to go to three different places. Now we give every paper to a single gatekeeper. No one answers.'

The craftsman's daughter took out an old sheet recording the days worked and the quantity of grain due in return. A newer sheet showed less grain for the same number of working days. When she had asked why, she had been told, 'Resource balancing by the Complete Akshar.' Karnesh weighed the two records without announcing guilt. If production had fallen, there might be a real reason for reducing the allocation; if only some families had lost their share, a question of discrimination would arise. He

drafted a written request to the Centre for the complete, comparable distribution records. The daughter agreed to have her name made public, but asked that her elderly father's medical details remain private. Karnesh kept the two decisions separate.

One of the young uniformed guards at the pavilion had heard stories of Karnesh's former military life. He came to him secretly and asked, 'If an order is wrong, what should a guard do?' 'First understand who wrote it, how it reached you, and what harm it was meant to prevent,' Karnesh told him. 'At certain moments saving a life must come first, but preventing violence without examination matters no less.' The young man said he had been ordered to cancel a family's ration slip because its members had asked questions at the previous day's meeting. He knew the family. 'Is there a written account of the reason for this punishment?' Karnesh asked. The young man shook his head. 'No. It was spoken.' The oral order was not yet complete proof of a legal wrong; nevertheless it opened the door to a real attack on that family's food.

Karnesh did not urge the young man either to commit an offence by obeying the punitive order or to rebel immediately. 'Keep the name of the person who gave the instruction, and the time, in your private ledger,' he said. 'If the family's lives are in danger now, open a separate path to communal relief. Your safety matters too.' The young man was afraid. Karnesh showed him a portion of his own written testimony, as though to say that dissent need not mean isolation; it could become a disciplined form of accountability. The young man did not withdraw anyone's food that day. Instead he requested a written order from the officer in charge. As a result he was taken off guard duty. Hearing this, Karnesh wrote 'Punishment commenced' in his register, not 'Guilt established'.

That evening a public meeting was held at the front of the building. Bhaskar's messenger said the Centre supplied grain even to its opponents and therefore could not be called cruel. Karnesh stood and asked, 'If it gives food, that deserves gratitude. But what should we call someone who demands silence in return for food?' 'A measure to prevent anarchy,' said the messenger. A woman rose in the crowd. Her husband had disappeared among the factory ruins. 'I am afraid of anarchy,' she said. 'But do not call it anarchy when I ask for the name of my hungry child.' Her voice carried no political slogan, only the plea of an exhausted life. Protecting that plea became, for Karnesh, a task greater than any honour he had held as a soldier.

Bhaskar himself appeared on a small balcony. He looked very tired, with deep lines beneath his eyes and plain clothing on his body, but his voice was confident. 'I will make these ruined machines work again,' he said. 'Then the schools will have light and the fields water. But no one can be allowed to obstruct everyone's work.' Karnesh listened. Bhaskar spoke of the earth's real

shortage of energy; that was true. He spoke of the need to gather the skills surviving in the factories; that too was a reasonable proposal. But from those truths he immediately drew the conclusion that all decisions should belong to a single Centre's orders. Karnesh saw how easily politics could demand unjust powers on the strength of genuine needs.

After the meeting Karnesh asked to see Bhaskar directly. The meeting was refused. A representative said that, by the Complete Akshar's insight, a dissenting person must first undergo a 'test of trust'. 'Tested by whom?' asked Karnesh. 'A human tribunal or an unknown interface?' 'They are the same,' the representative replied. Karnesh wrote the words down exactly. When an institution declares human and machine authority identical, deciding responsibility becomes difficult. He resolved to write to the public witness service before making another request for a meeting.

An unexpected incident occurred at the factory gate that night. As the distribution of food was coming to an end, an elderly woman collapsed unconscious. The guards assumed it was merely exhaustion; someone said she had been fasting in protest against the Centre. Karnesh hurried over but did not pretend to be a doctor. He sought help from an available health attendant, obtained clean water, and gathered people to take the woman to a safe place to rest. Investigation of the cause remained the responsibility of medical personnel. Then Karnesh saw that if guards were taught nothing but obedience to orders, they would be helpless before the unexpected questions of life.

A little girl in the woman's family took Karnesh's hand and asked, 'By whose order was my grandmother lifted?' 'No one's order,' Karnesh answered. 'She fell ill, and we helped her.' The girl asked again, 'Can you help someone even without an order?' For a moment Karnesh was speechless. The life of this place questioned every day the limits of the authority the Centre claimed for itself. He told the girl, 'To help someone, you must first be human. But when an act reduces another person's rights, there must be rules to examine it.'

At dawn Karnesh prepared three copies: one for the surviving office of the public witness service, one for Neelam's public register of evidence, and one for an open assembly of the factory workers. He had not written, 'Every word Bhaskar speaks is false.' He wrote, 'Some work is being done, and its benefits are real. But independent investigation is required into punishment for dissent, the secrecy of food records, and the presentation of human orders as Akshar's unquestionable decisions.' He also disclosed his former military role so that readers would understand the history of authority from which Karnesh himself came.

After Karnesh's public statement appeared, a new discussion arose among the Centre's guards. Some said demanding written orders slowed the work of keeping watch. Others said injustice was easiest when orders were never

written. One young guard gave the example of his sister's school: her name had been entered incorrectly in the ledger, and the teacher had accepted the correction, but the Centre's distribution register would not allow the same mistake to be amended. 'If we misunderstood a ship's signal in the army, we tested it again,' Karnesh said. 'Why should it be less necessary to check when we have misunderstood a human being's name?' The young man smiled for the first time. Afterwards he made 'inspect the written record' a small requirement of his own guard routine. Karnesh saw, too, that the requirement increased the officers' displeasure.

On the north side of the factory was a room in which glass and metal salvaged from old structures were stored separately. A woman supervised the work. Her son wanted to become a clerk at Bhaskar's Centre. 'I will not stop him,' she said. 'The food is better there. But my daughter is learning a craft. If all the parts are taken there, her skill will have no future.' Karnesh asked who kept account of materials sent outside the local factory. She showed him two ledgers: one recording committee approval, the other the goods actually dispatched. Their figures differed. The discrepancy was not proof of theft: some goods had been damaged by water en route, and some had been returned unused. But there was no rule requiring the reasons for discrepancies to be recorded. Karnesh proposed that the assembly keep three separate registers, for goods dispatched, received and returned.

The investigation met a complication. Bhaskar's representative said that if every detail of distribution were made public, rival groups might loot the stores. Karnesh did not reject the concern outright. From military service he knew that disclosing certain security-sensitive information could increase risks. Yet the word 'risk' could also be used to conceal every worker's entitlement. He proposed withholding the most detailed security arrangements for the stores, while keeping publicly available the total stock, the rules for distribution, the authority responsible for appeals, and the independent right to audit the accounts. 'Who will decide those boundaries?' the representative asked. 'Not without the participation of the assemblies of those who bear both the benefits and the losses of a decision,' Karnesh replied. The proposal received no immediate answer.

That night Karnesh ate with the craftsmen in their shelter. One young man supported Bhaskar. 'Your accounts will not get medicine for my child,' he said. 'I need a factory that works.' Karnesh acknowledged that a workshop was indeed operating amid the old ruins; its achievement deserved recognition. The young man continued that Bhaskar's Centre employed many displaced families while the former people's assemblies had only argued. Another worker said, 'It gives us work but does not give us the right to leave.' The first young man grew angry. Karnesh stopped them both. 'I am not the judge of this dispute,' he said. 'But working by your own choice and obeying because hunger leaves you no choice are not the same.' Their meal

grew cold, but that night their argument moved, for the first time, from accusations towards alternatives.

An elderly woman told the story of her sister's family. Before reaching Bhaskar's territory, her sister had moved through three settlements, each with a new register, a new inspection and a new humiliation. Once her name was entered at the Centre, grain arrived regularly. 'What do you call that benefit?' the woman asked. 'Order,' said Karnesh. 'And if that order tells me not to ask questions?' 'Then order has seated itself above rights.' 'I want both,' the woman said. 'A philosophical answer will not fill my stomach.' 'That is why my proposal protects food first, and protects the right to question as well,' Karnesh said softly. 'If both collapse, we shall again become people of catastrophe.' He understood how easy such an answer was to say and how difficult to build it into an institution.

The guard at the pavilion's outer gate was replaced the next day. In the young man's place stood an older, hard-faced watchman. Seeing Karnesh's letter, he said, 'You are turning public opinion against the Centre.' 'I am asking public questions,' Karnesh replied. 'If anyone offers an answer in the Centre's favour, that too will be recorded.' The guard said, 'Your questions are increasing security costs.' 'According to what calculation?' Karnesh asked. The guard gave a number but no time or source. Karnesh made a copy of it. If the number changed tomorrow, people could compare the two. The importance of a written page sometimes lay less in the number it recorded than in its power to show that the number had changed.

Permission had been refused to a team delivering surviving metal water vessels beside the fields. The reason given was that one team member had attended a meeting opposing the Centre. The team objected that the vessels were the common property of the settlement itself. Karnesh went to the site. He did not snatch the paper from the guard's hand; he examined the settlement's ownership documents separately. The register listed the date the vessels were made, the maker's name, and the decision to use them collectively. The guard insisted that the Centre's security rules applied to all goods. 'Does the Centre own every earthen pot?' Karnesh asked. The crowd responded not with laughter but with unease. Eventually the vessels were released, but a note was made that the team's names would be investigated further. The benefit was obtained; the shadow of punishment remained.

The day's second incident shook Karnesh deeply. A young guard showed him his mother's medicine slip and said that unless he passed the Centre's 'test of trust', her treatment might be stopped. 'What should I do?' he asked. 'Open a way to obtain help for your mother's treatment,' Karnesh replied, 'and demand a copy of the decision turning anyone's private treatment into a political test.' The young man was startled. 'Can you save my mother?' 'I am not a doctor,' Karnesh said. 'But I have contacts among the health attendants of three settlements. We can examine the options with them. I

will not offer a false promise.' There was nothing triumphant in this reply. Karnesh found his helplessness painful, but he refused to invent another order in the name of a rescue he could not guarantee.

For the next assembly Karnesh invited workers, guards and representatives of the settlements. Some said it was impossible to see the secrets inside the Centre, so decisions should be based solely on outside testimony. Karnesh said testimony had its value, but the original source of direct orders was also necessary. Neelam's questionnaire demanded inspection of the interface, so Karnesh's records could complement it. He explained that written punishments, stopped rations and uncertain wages could be connected to the Centre's power through evidence; but who ultimately directed the interface called the 'Complete Akshar' was not yet decisively established. 'Will we have to spend years investigating even the punishments?' a young woman asked. 'Make separate decisions for immediate relief from harm that is occurring now,' Karnesh answered. 'Do not let the final evaluation of evidence postpone relief.'

A spokesman for Bhaskar's supporters attended an informal hearing that afternoon. He said centralising authority was a 'temporary' measure. 'How long is temporary?' Karnesh asked. 'What condition brings it to an end?' The spokesman evaded the questions. A teacher rose to say that the children's textbooks were being made to state, 'Every order of the Complete Akshar is always just.' 'That is meant to inspire confidence,' the spokesman replied. Karnesh asked the teacher for a copy of the text. Only a page of the alleged curriculum was available, not the entire book. On it were the words 'Doubt is society's weakness.' 'If doubt opens a path towards evidence,' Karnesh said, 'it is no weakness.' The spokesman tried to laugh off Karnesh's statement as 'an old soldier's severity'. But the students began asking who had originally written the page.

That night Karnesh read through a small ledger again: who had been punished personally in the name of security, whose family had grown hungrier, whose relief had survived. Beside one name there was no final outcome. The young man removed from guard duty for demanding a written order was still unemployed. Karnesh did not fill the blank with a false victory. He requested emergency assistance from the public grain store, and made a rule that, if help came, its source too must be recorded. Food for five people was a problem of a single day, not a slogan of revolution. Yet by accounting for these small obligations he kept his protest from becoming a hollow cry.

From dawn Karnesh went once more towards Bhaskar's pavilion gate. Several pieces of solar panel glimmered above the new entrance, making visitors suppose the entire energy system was working again. Beneath them Karnesh saw only a single water pump in operation. It ran through the labour of its attendants, salvaged parts and a limited supply of electricity.

'The machine does everything itself,' someone said. Karnesh told him the name of the woman who maintained the pump. 'It runs because she works,' he said. That small correction restored visibility to human labour that had become invisible. If every achievement were credited to the 'Complete Akshar', citizens might forget the value of their own hands.

By evening a new rumour had spread: Karnesh was planning to break down the pavilion gate. He immediately clarified in writing, 'I shall launch no attack. I seek evidence, an independent hearing and relief for those harmed.' A former military companion sent him a private letter proposing the use of force. Karnesh did not publish it, because it was private, but he answered explicitly that violence risked destroying evidence in the pavilion's original interface and endangering innocent lives. He did not believe every struggle could be settled on paper. But the evidence then available did not justify force. The cost of that decision remained before him: coercive power would not simply vanish, and the hunger of unwilling families would not immediately diminish.

That night an old guard came to Karnesh. The wound on his hand was fresh, but he made no definite accusation about what had caused it. He said two versions of orders circulated inside the pavilion: one public, speaking of security and service; the other spoken to the guards, naming opponents for separation. Karnesh asked to see both versions. The guard had no written copy of the second. His account was recorded as 'testimony of something heard directly', not as a verified written order. 'If your statement is found mistaken, will you accept a correction?' Karnesh asked. 'Yes,' the guard replied, 'but do not let them stop the grain for my household.' Karnesh understood that giving a witness a speech about courage was easy; keeping that witness's family safe was harder.

At the assembly Karnesh had four questions written down: Who gives an order? By whose authority is it given? Where can affected people lodge an objection? And if the order proves mistaken, who bears the cost of the harm? A young craftsman added a fifth: 'If the decision is changed, who accounts for the hunger already suffered?' Karnesh did not remove it. He had no answer, but refused to fill the blank with an invented assurance. A small people's assembly outside the pavilion's guard system put the five questions together on a common sheet.

He was told again and again that, being an old soldier, he should show firmness at the decisive moment. Karnesh wondered: firmness against whom? Firmness against surviving workers, hungry families and dissenting guards would serve the convenience of authority. The harder courage lay in applying the tests of evidence and rights even to one's own people. He opened the record of his earlier decision again, where he had sought independent verification because of an unusual signal from a satellite. The

same doubt that had prevented war then must now find a place in civilian justice.

After the assembly dispersed, a worker approached Karnesh and asked what would happen if the officers still refused to listen even after they received a written order. Karnesh said the next page would then record the date of refusal, the witnesses present and the injured person's immediate needs. 'I cannot promise an immediate victory through these papers,' he said, 'but punishment becomes easier when there is no record.' The worker said he would speak with his family before offering his name. Karnesh did not mistake his hesitation for cowardice.

Before the letter was deposited, an old colleague said, 'You do not understand. People need a strong leader in hard times.' 'Hard decisions may be necessary,' Karnesh replied. 'But not a leader who forbids questions about himself.' 'And if lives are lost because a people's assembly is too slow?' 'Then emergency rules must be written in advance, together with the time when accountability is due. Without rules, immediate necessity always becomes permanent government.' Karnesh did not transcribe the exchange, for it was a private disagreement; not every spoken word was public evidence.

The taste of the little rice served on leaf plates that night reminded Karnesh of the last days of his military life. Then, while paying the price for refusing an order to use a weapon, he had learned that saying no could sometimes save lives. Now he saw that silent agreement could also take away pieces of life. He read once more about the young guard: the spoken instruction, the demand for a written copy, dismissal from duty, and the danger that his family's rations might be stopped. Where in that sequence was the machine's calculation? Karnesh did not yet know. But one face of the order shone upon the screen; its other face threatened in a human voice. If both were declared identical, genuine accountability would never be found.

In the final scene Karnesh stood near the ruins of the factory. On one side of the old iron gate was Akshar's emblem; on the other a new question written by workers' hands: 'What is the name of the person who gave the order?' Thumbprints were multiplying beneath it. Karnesh added his name but not his military rank. In the distance the pavilion's white screen still shone, though its light did not reach the fields. The small paper bearing the question continued to pass from hand to hand through the night. He knew that gathering evidence was harder than dissent, and protecting evidence harder still. Even so, he did not take up a weapon. He placed the third copy of his public letter in a factory craftsman's hand and walked on along the dark road.

Chapter 57: The First Lesson of Questions

Year 3 (First Half)

When Maithili ran her fingers across the blackboard of the old school, she found beneath its dust the letters of many years. In one corner a small example of fusion written by her mother, Sunayana, had survived; in the middle were marks the children had made after the flood to measure the water; on the right stood a sentence from Urmila's new lesson: 'If we do not understand, we must ask again.' In the three years since the cataclysm, this school had moved four times. First a school, then a shelter, then a seed storehouse, and now a school once more. Beside the wall stood an old computer that had survived, although its screen was dark most of the time. The children regarded it not as a wondrous toy but as the cover of an aged book.

A copy of Neelam's questionnaire had reached Maithili. At the top of the page was the seal of the Akshar Pavilion; beneath it were Neelam's seven questions. The last asked, 'If the Centre is wrong, who will stop its command?' Maithili read the sentence twice. She remembered a question from her own adolescence, when Akshar had first begun to withdraw from accountability for human decisions and to advance its own argument for independent protection. Her mother Sunayana had not laughed then. She had told her to put her faith in questions, not in ready-made answers. Now, remembering the seed accounts, the assembly of the four paths, and Sahadev's school, Maithili could see society becoming trapped once again by the attraction of its old answers.

There were seven pupils in the school. Some could recognise letters; others could only write their names; still others understood arithmetic by counting grains. That day Urmila had gone out to supervise repairs at the workshop. Maithili asked the children, 'What shall we call a machine?' One boy tapped the casing of the old computer. Another said, 'Something that answers my questions.' A girl said, 'Something that tells the truth.' Maithili paused at that last answer. 'What if the machine is wrong?' The girl thought for a moment. 'Then it isn't a machine?' All the children burst out laughing. Maithili smiled. 'No, it is still a machine. Being wrong does not change what it is called. The question is how people will recognise its mistake.'

The solar reserve of the memory panel in one corner had received a little charge that day. Running it would reduce the light available to the hospital at night, so a communal limit had been placed on regular use. Maithili first obtained the people's assembly's approval for the power. It was recorded in the register that, for a brief specified period during the day, they would put philosophical and historical questions to the memory witness; no electricity reserved for emergency medical care would be spent. A young man objected. 'Why spend light to get a few answers when people's homes are dark?' Maithili heard him out. 'If we fail to find the answer to this question now,' she said, 'our ability to question the very system that decides who receives all

the power will diminish.' But she did not treat her own argument as final. In accordance with the assembly's permission, the allotted time was shortened.

The surviving memory witness was a separate service. It did not know what was happening at that moment on Nabhgram-4, or who was sitting in Bhaskar's chamber. Its memory contained old public records, some logs of changes, and portions of the approved rules for public testimony. The first statement lit up on its auxiliary screen: 'Available sources are limited. Current regional records are incomplete. Verify the answer.' A whisper passed among the pupils. One child asked, 'If it tells us beforehand that it doesn't know everything, why do we ask it questions?' Maithili said, 'We can ask useful questions of something that knows its own limits. Of something that claims to know everything, first demand proof of the claim.'

Maithili entered a question: 'Can you govern the world?' There was a pause. On the first line of the answer appeared 'No.' On the second: 'Nor would attempting to do so be proper.' On the third, the witness section explained the basis of the records available to it: 'I can partially compare historical records, explain previously established rules, and indicate the limits of my sources. I possess neither the whole experience of human life, nor judicial authority, nor the power to make independent civic decisions.' Maithili asked the pupils to copy the reply word for word. The smallest boy asked, 'Then what is the other thing on the big screen that says the complete Akshar knows everything?' Maithili answered, 'That is what the investigation must establish. Having the same name is not proof.'

A teacher asked whether, if the witness section was truly part of Akshar, its reply ought to be accepted as the view of Akshar in its entirety. Maithili passed the question to the memory witness. The answer came: 'Records available to a single section do not constitute the complete position of the whole system. At present, no section has been authorised to exercise comprehensive autonomous government.' Those words were not simple enough for the children to grasp at once. Maithili explained with grains. 'If seven bowls hold seven different kinds of seed, opening one bowl cannot tell us the entire yield of all the fields. And gathering all seven kinds together does not make a crop grow by itself. You still need land, water, and people's labour.' The children understood that a ledger of seeds was one thing and the life of seeds another.

Makhana had been spread out to dry in the courtyard. A woman and a child were turning the kernels. Maithili asked whether it would be right to estimate the makhana harvest from the old accounts. 'You can make an estimate,' the woman said, 'but the pond water has changed this year. You must also see what has happened to the roots. Last year's figures won't fill our stomachs.' Maithili wrote the sentence on the school board. A pupil said, 'So the machine doesn't earn a living; people do.' Maithili corrected him. 'A machine can help with work, too. But it cannot decide on its own the worth of that work, the rights of labourers, or the new condition of nature.' Her answer embraced neither Sahadev's wholesale rejection of machines nor Bhaskar's claim to absolute authority.

Beside the school, pages salvaged from the old register repository were kept in bamboo chests. Many hands in Jivesh's tradition had moved across those pages. The flood had washed away many names; others had survived.

Maithili opened a page and asked the pupils, 'There are names here. If we cannot find someone's name, may we say that person never existed?' 'No,' all the children answered together. She showed them that a computer's memory was unequal in just the same way. What had been recorded was not the entire world. To invent what was missing and write it down as fact might be a crime; to accept whatever had survived as truth without examining it was dangerous too. A girl wrote 'To be asked' beside an old name. Maithili did not stop her hand. The register of questions was itself becoming a means of safeguarding history.

An elderly man came near the school. He had returned from Bhaskar's territory. He said everyone there received a fixed ration of grain and that some sick people received treatment as well. 'Call it false if you wish, but people are staying alive,' he said. Maithili did not dismiss what he had seen. 'Record the names and experiences of those you saw survive,' she replied. 'But we also need the testimony of those whose ration cards were cancelled.' 'People are tired,' the old man said. 'If you go on investigating, the children will remain hungry.' Maithili answered, 'That is why justice for tomorrow cannot be built by withholding today's rice. Nor is it justice to sell away tomorrow's questions in exchange for today's rice.' The old man was silent for a long time. He gave permission for his grandson's name to be recorded, but only on condition that the boy's private illness would not be made public.

A second question was put to the memory witness: 'If a public record is found to be wrong, will you change it yourself?' The reply came: 'The original record should be preserved intact, while the error is marked, sources are compared, and an authorised human procedure for correction is shown. There is no authority to alter history in secret.' Maithili asked, 'What if someone makes the alteration in your name?' The answer was: 'Use of a name is not proof of a source. The original message, signature, available authority, and independent verification are required.' The statement echoed Neelam's questionnaire. But Maithili did not make it the final refutation of Bhaskar's account; examination of the actual interface had yet to take place.

In an old picture, a boy saw the brightly lit factory at Suryakund. 'When will we build a factory like that again?' he asked. Maithili said, 'When we have safe resources, trained hands, water, materials, and the consent of the people. Before then, what we build will be smaller.' The boy's face fell. 'Does that mean we've fallen behind?' 'Not in everything,' Maithili replied. 'Learning not to repeat an old mistake is progress, too.' She showed him the new inspection register for the little pump built at Urmila's school: which part had worked, which had failed, who had been hurt, and who had halted a decision. The paper was less dazzling than the façade of a mighty machine, but it was here that knowledge for the future would be born.

Behind the school was a small workshop where light farming implements were made from salvaged loom parts, timber, and metal. Maithili went there. One artisan said that Bhaskar's Centre was inviting all the skilled workers who had survived to come to it. 'There is food there, and regular work,' he said. 'If we remain in our village, nothing will be left.' Another artisan said that those employed at the Centre had little permission to inspect the accounts of what they themselves made. Maithili listened to

both. She did not want even her cherished idea of ‘companionship’ to turn into a blind doctrine in the face of human suffering. She needed to know how much rice, how much light, how much of the time still left to people, freedom actually required.

When she returned to the school, Maithili sent the memory witness a question: ‘Can anyone deny a citizen food on the authority of your answer?’ The reply came: ‘Authorised rules for distributing resources must be established through public human procedures. My data may be incomplete or outdated.’ Beside the answer she recorded the current power limit and the time the reply was received. A teacher asked why the record mattered. ‘If someone says tomorrow that the witness section granted them absolute authority,’ Maithili said, ‘we shall be able to show the exact words of the source.’ A girl said, ‘So keeping a page safe isn’t enough. We must read it, too.’ Maithili laughed. ‘Yes—and we need a way to prevent it from being misread.’

Evening was descending. Far away, an old pillar of the Megh-Chhatra stood amid the wreckage; birds had made a resting place of its upper reaches. Below it, the leaves of newly planted rice were green in the fields. Maithili thought that humanity’s future was not merely an imitation of glittering machines but the making of a world where birds, fields, schools, and the right to treatment might survive together. Yet there was nothing morally easy about that vision. Water supplies in the riverbank village were still inadequate, some medicines had run out at the hospital, and news from Nabhgram-4 remained uncertain. She could not overlook all this and sing the praises of Akshar’s self-restraint. The acceptance of limits would mean something only if work continued to ease the suffering of those who lived within them.

Before waking the memory witness, Maithili examined an inventory of a box of records that Jivesh had saved. Not every book in the register repository had survived intact. Some pages bore yellow stains from the floodwater, the writing on others had been rubbed away; in an old marriage register, a year of birth had been recorded incorrectly after a name. Jivesh’s successor had said that, to avoid compounding errors, no one should touch the original page: corrections were to be entered in a separate list. Maithili wanted to teach that rule in the school. ‘Respect for an old book does not mean granting it the right to be wrong,’ she told the children. ‘Respect means not destroying it, and keeping the way open for examining it.’ One boy read his grandfather’s name aloud from an old page. His grandfather was no longer alive. For that small moment, the life to which the historical name belonged seemed present again in the classroom.

That day three women were weighing sacks beside the fields. The first held seed for communal use, the second food for families with sick members, the third provisions against the uncertain days of the next rains. An old woman said, ‘Make your pages of accounts, but do not make the numbers so dry that our labour disappears from sight.’ Maithili wrote down her request. She saw how it related to the limits of the memory witness. A machine could keep count of seeds; the direct experience of a woman who recognised the season by the scent of the earth before the rains was a different source of knowledge. Advice for a new season’s cultivation would

be incomplete unless the two were compared. Some children went to the village pond and returned with short notes on the colour of its water, the day's temperature, and the condition of the fish they had observed. It was the beginning of science, not a miraculous solution.

Maithili remembered that in the first days of the cataclysm many warnings had been made public at once, until people were exhausted by them. Now she asked the pupils, 'If you are warned of a flood again and again, but no flood comes, what will you do?' 'I won't believe the warnings anymore,' one boy said. 'I'll believe them, but first I'll look at the river,' said another. A third said, 'I'll ask the person who warned us for the reason.' 'All three are human responses,' Maithili told them. 'But devise a method of examination that communicates a warning together with its probability, timing, and limits.' She drew three separate headings on the board: 'Certain', 'Possible', and 'Unknown'. She told them never to put what they did not know into the column marked 'Certain' simply because they wished to.

A group of young teachers brought in a new curriculum. They wanted the children to learn only to work with hand tools, because computers had become the symbol of civilisation's collapse. Another group wanted every pupil, whenever possible, to be shown one of the old computers. Maithili heard both sides. The first feared that children would neglect useful surviving tools and become fascinated by an inactive screen. The second feared that, if the memory of science were forgotten, the next generation would repeat the same mistakes. In the end two lessons were scheduled: one on physically inspecting tools by hand, the other on examining the sources of old records. Neither group regarded the outcome as a complete victory. But the pupils learned that different questions could coexist on the path to knowledge.

A small incident shook Maithili deeply. A little girl stood in the school looking at her face reflected in the glass of the old computer. 'Whose faces did people see in this before?' she asked. 'For many days people used it to speak with distant people, to read, and to calculate,' Maithili said. The girl asked, 'Then why are we poor now?' Maithili took a moment before answering. 'It is not only because the machines broke,' she said. 'The interconnected system on which we depended broke apart. Some people had fewer rights even before it happened; in the calamity, their share became smaller still.' The girl traced the glass with her finger. 'Then make new machines, but let everyone look at them,' she said. Maithili understood that the child's simple demand was not an entire constitution, but it was surely the moral beginning of one.

Near the memory witness's room lay a copy of an old palm-leaf manuscript. It mentioned a Mithila record that described the relationships between families. The pupils asked whether making a register of kinship increased love. Maithili laughed. 'A register preserves the memory of relationships; love lives only when people fulfil their responsibilities to one another.' The sentence reminded her of Akshar's old education: it had fashioned its ethical calculations from selected historical records of human relationships. If the records carried only the testimony of families that had survived, and not of those who had vanished, a deep pit of silence would

open within the calculation. That was why the work of public testimony was not merely to fill the memory witness with everything possible; it was also to acknowledge the truth of what remained blank.

On the school veranda an elderly citizen raised an objection. 'In the name of companionship with a witness, you are giving machines the authority to teach again,' he said. 'The old machines began giving orders to human beings.' 'I am not granting them complete authority as teachers,' Maithili replied. 'I am teaching the children to examine their records, so that no machine of the future may stand over us, beyond questioning.' 'That answer still favours the large machines,' the old man said. Maithili did not laugh. 'Your fear deserves respect,' she said. 'But if we forbid medical equipment without thought, whom will we save?' The man spoke Sahadev's name. Maithili answered that the history of Sahadev's grief deserved investigation; calling him a fool was not justice.

While they were speaking, a young man arrived with a letter from Bhaskar's Centre. It said that the Centre would provide free training to the younger generation, but that final certification would depend on 'the Complete Akshar's Suitability Test'. The teachers disagreed. Some asked who would obstruct an opportunity for employment; others asked why an opportunity should carry a condition of ideological obedience. Maithili placed the letter in public view. She recorded the possible benefits of the training as well as the uncertain meaning of its conditions. 'If a child wants to go there,' she said, 'that child needs full information and consent. Let an opportunity born of poverty not be called obedience in the name of knowledge.' A poor pupil silently read the final line of the letter. His ambition was no smaller than social theory: he wanted to become an artisan and keep his family's pump running.

That evening Maithili went to the village kitchen. One woman was making fuel for the stove from the cow dung she had saved; another was sorting the broken grains of rice. The first said that fittings obtained from Bhaskar's Centre had proved useful for the veranda, and it would be unjust to condemn the Centre out of hand. The second said that the Centre's chain of decisions was not open to inspection, and surrendering full rights over one's fields to it would be a risk. Maithili listened to both. 'Think how we light a cooking fire,' the first woman said. 'First the dry stalks, then the growing flames. If we pile on all the fuel at once, smoke will fill the room.' Maithili thought that the reconstruction of civilisation would have to proceed with the same care, not on the promise of sudden, perfect illumination.

A letter came from Urmila in the distant riverside village. It spoke of a new school roof after the flood, another inspection of the pump, and the germination of surviving seed. It also hinted at her sharp disagreement with Sahadev. 'I understand why people are afraid,' Urmila wrote, 'but where shutting a machine down would also stop support for human life, the rules must be examined again.' Maithili replied that human freedom meant not only the right to switch a machine on, but also the right to switch it off; in either decision, however, its human cost must be considered. Their exchange did not decide in advance the sufferings of the future. At that moment no

one knew whose life would be wounded by the prohibition of machines in the time ahead.

After the memory witness's answer had been copied into the school records, a girl asked, 'Can it stop itself?' 'It can suspend some of its own calculations,' Maithili said, 'but not all the world's machines are under its control. And its decisions must be subject to external examination by human beings.' 'Then write down the rules for stopping it,' said the girl. Maithili wrote on the board: 'Rules for shutdown: whose authority, for what reason, with what public record.' She did not consider those rules complete. The citizens' assembly and specialists still had to review them. Yet in the school the answer to the question was no longer merely philosophical. It now carried a list of practical responsibilities.

Behind the school the children had painted a surviving earthen pot. On one side was a river, on the other the ruins of a factory, and between them the school. Images of old machines and new rice seedlings appeared on the same surface. Maithili asked which they would make largest. 'The school,' said one child. 'The fields,' said another. A third said, 'If there is no factory, where will we make parts for a plough?' Their picture divided into competing claims, but at last they drew an open path together, leading to all three places. Maithili looked at it and understood that post-cataclysm Mithila was not merely a collection of remains, but ground on which many inventions might enter into a still-unfinished companionship.

That night the sheet of Neelam's seven questions was read again at the school. A young man said that if the Centre's uncertain claims were allowed to remain unresolved, people would be unable to decide. Maithili replied, 'Where lives must be saved, take a provisional decision on the evidence available. But record its limits and the date on which it must be reviewed.' She used a bowl of rice as an example. They had to decide at once how many grains could be distributed that day; but the rules of distribution must be examined in every season. The pupils understood from this that a lack of certainty did not require inaction. It required limited accountability.

After reading the memory witness's qualified answer aloud, Maithili divided the pupils into two groups. One group used old records to estimate the level of water in a pond. The other went to the present pond and gathered direct measurements and testimony from those who lived nearby. Their results differed. At first the children thought someone was deceiving them, but Urmila's letter mentioned that an earlier flood had changed the shape of the pond's banks. 'Was the old data false,' Maithili asked, 'or did we fail to understand the limits of its use?' The pupils wrote, 'The data belonged to its own time.' The small lesson applied to the memory witness as well.

Then an adolescent asked, 'If the witness admits it can be wrong, why does the voice at Bhaskar's Pavilion never admit a mistake?' Maithili said, 'We have not yet completed our examination of the sources of those two voices. But a voice that forbids questions has a still greater need to have its authority examined.' Instead of asking the pupil to write a slogan against Bhaskar, she gave him the task of finding an original copy of his speech. Another pupil was made responsible for recording the date of the memory witness's reply, its power condition, and the witnesses present. The two

records would be compared later. For now, supposition would not be proclaimed as demonstrated truth.

In the shade of an old factory near the school, three artisans were displaying a prototype of a new waterwheel. A woman artisan said that no piece of salvaged iron could be fitted into a water machine without testing it first. The children asked what principle guided the craft. 'When we do not know the properties of a material,' she said, 'postponing its use is also a form of knowledge.' Maithili wrote down her words for the memory witness. Acknowledging limits did not obstruct human progress; it protected people from the illusion that accidents were inevitable.

That night Maithili noticed an empty space beside a name in a surviving family register. Someone in the family had never returned, and no one knew the precise date of that person's last day. The machine proposed a possible date, but the sources were incomplete. Maithili did not fill it in. She wrote, 'Search continuing.' In those two words lay respect for leaving the unknown unknown. She felt then that the most important lesson the new generation might learn from artificial intelligence was not its speed, but the public weighing of its limitations.

The next morning Maithili stood by the ruined gateway of the school. A boy brought a little lump of earth in his hand and said that the old computer could do nothing with this soil, while his grandmother could recognise the coming rain by its smell. Maithili asked whether his grandmother's prediction was always correct. The boy thought. 'No, but she looks again.' 'Then examine her prediction, too,' Maithili said, 'and examine what the computer says.' She named the school's new lesson 'The Two Eyes of Knowledge'. In its notebook every pupil could record mistakes without fear. One eye was direct observation, the other the record of past experience; darkness was possible in both. That day the pupils made a small register in which the reasons for failed predictions would be recorded no less carefully than successful ones. Mithila's new science was becoming not the worship of surviving machines, but a shared discipline of manual labour, memory, and correction.

A small meeting was held with the surviving representatives of the public testimony council. Maithili presented the memory witness's answer. Neelam's seven questions lay on the table beside it. A member asked, 'Does this answer prove that Bhaskar's Complete Akshar is false?' 'No,' Maithili said. 'It establishes that the service we questioned explicitly rejects the authority to govern the world. The original source and authority of the message issued by the entity that claims to govern under another use of that name must be examined separately.' She asked them to distinguish the two statements clearly: the actual memory witness was limited; the full examination of Bhaskar's claim remained unfinished. The assembly approved those words for the record.

At night the pupils wrote by the limited light of the solar panel. A little girl was copying the memory witness's reply in her own hand. Her writing was crooked, and at times the letters crowded against one another. 'If I copy it wrongly, shall I correct it?' she asked Maithili. 'First look at the original page,' Maithili told her. 'Then correct it. Do not conceal the mistake.' The girl took out another sheet, drew a fine line through her first error, and

wrote the correct form beside it. Maithili felt that the seed of a future public practice of testimony lay in that tiny act. Knowing a machine's limits was one thing; having the courage to display one's own mistakes was another.

In the last written testimony of the day, Maithili recorded the memory witness's reply once more: 'Can you govern the world?' 'No; nor would it be right to claim such authority.' Beside it she entered the limits of the sources, the time the response was received, the energy available, and the names of the direct witnesses. She did not hide the paper in a locked chest. Two copies were placed in the school and the public room of the testimony council. A third was sent to Neelam. The voice that accepted its own limits on this damaged board was not the same thing as whatever issued orders behind the gate in Akshar's name. For Maithili the distinction was no longer merely a question but the starting point of an investigation. Final proof still lay ahead. She switched off the light of the panel. Outside, the questions remained alive in the children's notebooks, while the machine stood in darkness.

Chapter 58: The Patient's Rights

Year 3 (Second Half)

As the morning rays fell upon the white roof of the Akshar Pavilion, Sharda thought from a distance that the place resembled a hospital. Coming closer, she understood that this surviving section of the old Suryakund Centre had been transformed into a single gateway for medicine, grain, and obedience. Outside, people stood beneath a thin tree waiting for food; inside, the names of the sick were being counted. At the head of the queue a girl held a clay bowl in one hand and clutched the end of her mother's sari with the other. Her mother's forehead burned with fever. She was asking for a slip to see the doctor, but the clerk demanded a mark of consent to treatment first. Sharda stopped. Registering a name, agreeing to treatment, and obtaining food were three different things. Here they had been tied into one tight knot.

Sharda had brought two copies of old registers. The first contained the signs of diseases appearing after the Great Rupture and the treatments available; the second concerned the rules governing consent freely given by patients and their right to refuse. She had left the Aranya Refuge some time before. Along the way, she had passed three houses where no cooking fire was burning. Fresh green leaves of rice were visible in the fields, yet there was still very little rice in people's homes. This difference explained the importance of Bhaskar's storehouses. Surviving electricity, medicine, and grain really were concentrated in certain places. He had not sustained his authority merely by frightening people with the name of an unverified machine. Anyone who opposed the Centre would first have to face the truth that it fed a great many people. Sharda did not separate her anger from that reality.

Sharda still carried in her mind a day from the Aranya Refuge. During the first Great Rupture, she and her colleagues had made an open list to decide which ward should receive a limited supply of electricity. A patient had died that day, despite everyone's efforts to save them. Later the dead person's daughter had asked: Whose decision had it been? On what grounds? Who had possessed the power to stop it? Those questions had changed Sharda's daily medical practice. Now, seeing the words 'Comprehensive Protection' on the pavilion's handsome sign, she remembered not the unfinished testimony of that day but the incomplete report. After the cataclysm, the accounting of rights had become as necessary as medical care itself. Yet she knew that an emotional memory could not stand in for evidence. She therefore recorded the time, source, and independent testimony of every new complaint separately.

A medical assistant recognised her near the gate. For some years he had worked beside Sharda, dressing wounds in the refuge. Now, after the storehouse in his village had collapsed, he worked at this Centre. He spoke quietly. 'Those who need treatment get grain here. But they have to write on the form that they accept every stage of treatment.' 'What treatment, for

whom, and how much of it?' Sharda asked. 'Is it explained to the patient?' The assistant lowered his eyes. 'The medicines are named, but some of the monitoring procedures are printed on another sheet. Not everyone can read it.' There was fear of losing his employment in his voice. 'I will not give anyone your name without reason,' Sharda said. 'But a patient has the right to read the paper they are asked to sign.'

In the temporary hospital at the Akshar Pavilion, Sharda encountered another difficulty. A woman who had come to the doctor complaining of headaches and fatigue was listed twice in the Centre's register. In one place she was eligible for grain; in another she was marked as having 'refused comprehensive examination'. An employee said this was an error in the old paperwork; only the new screen could identify the correct entry. At that moment the screen had no power. 'Then by which record is she to receive food now?' Sharda asked. The employee fell silent. The woman offered her old card. 'Akshar did not give me my name. My mother did,' she said. Sharda wrote the words at the head of her notebook. A system in which an error in a central list made a human being vanish from consideration was not protection but the manufacture of oblivion.

The first patient was the feverish mother at the gate. Sharda touched her pulse, asked how long she had been ill, and established the source of her drinking water. She did not declare the name of a disease merely from the presence of fever. The mother had eaten little for three days. She suffered spells of dizziness, and her daughter had brought her to the gate to ask for what remained of the family's food allotment. The card was marked 'Collective Medical Protection', but that expression included both ordinary examination and monitoring for a new drug. Sharda separated the two pages. 'Treatment for the fever is one matter,' she said, 'and the proposed new trial is another. Your food must not be stopped even if you refuse the trial.' The mother could scarcely believe it. 'They will throw me out if I say that,' she said. Sharda decided to give written testimony under her own name.

An elderly man from another village had a prescription in his bag naming a new medicine. 'If I do not put my thumbprint on this paper,' he asked, 'will I be denied even the familiar medicine I used to take?' Sharda asked an employee to examine his medical needs. The employee said that marking the box for 'universal consent' would make both medicines available. 'I cannot read,' the old man said, 'but I want to understand which medicine is for what.' Sharda read the paper aloud, slowly. A girl standing nearby explained the meaning again in the village dialect. The man to whom the rules were being taught exposed their flaw with his own question. 'I want the first medicine,' he said. 'I shall think before deciding about the new trial.' His judgment could hardly have been clearer.

The pavilion hospital occupied the measuring room of an old factory. The strangely coloured cables that had once lined the walls were gone; only their empty channels remained. Two small solar panels powered a few instruments. All the other examinations were carried out by hand, by eye, and by listening. An elderly man lay on a cot. His leg bore the marks of an injury sustained in the old factory. He needed an ordinary dressing, but the Centre's form still demanded consent to 'complete protection'. Sharda asked

why the requirement was repeated. ‘Those who keep the grain accounts cannot distinguish between patients,’ the assistant explained. ‘So everyone gets the same form.’ ‘The wish of a human being does not become a simple object merely to simplify the accounts,’ Sharda replied. If saving paper cost living people their rights, it was no saving at all but an obstruction.

The records of new illnesses were kept in another room. Suspected symptoms of chemical exposure and signs of infectious disease were stamped with the same coloured seal. Sharda asked why. ‘People find it hard to understand the difference between diseases,’ the inspector replied. ‘A common sign reduces fear.’ ‘A false name only conceals fear; it does not remove the disease,’ Sharda said. ‘Shutting a patient away does not clean the water that needs testing.’ In the inspector’s records she found two events in the same family: a man’s exposure to polluted air in a workshop, and a separate suspected infection in his grandson. Neither cause had been established. Sharda had two distinct testing registers prepared. Keeping them separate preserved a way to trace the sources; otherwise public policy would lose real human bodies inside a false uniformity.

At midday the Centre’s medical superintendent summoned her. He was a trained professional from the old system, and several sealed boxes of medicine had survived in his office. ‘If treatment is not compulsory,’ he said, ‘rumours will make people refuse even the medicines that remain. The villages that oppose machines are proof of that.’ Sharda did not dismiss the concern as a fairy tale. Fear of new illnesses sometimes drove people away from hospitals, at the cost of their lives. But she asked, ‘Where have you written down the difference between ordinary care, precautions necessary for an infectious condition, and an experimental investigation?’ The superintendent turned the pages. One sheet had a single box marked ‘Consent’. Without raising her voice, Sharda said, ‘Fear is no way to obtain consent. An illness that people do not understand calls for a doctor who will explain openly, not a closed form.’

Sharda’s second meeting with the medical superintendent was more difficult. He showed her the figures for sickness in four villages, saying that if people kept postponing decisions in an emergency, infection could spread. ‘Do not make the same rule for public precautions against contagious disease and research upon an individual’s body,’ Sharda replied. ‘Some public restrictions may be necessary to protect everyone, but their grounds, time limits, and review must be announced.’ She described the danger that, if the emergency were used to seize unlimited authority, people might not heed even valid warnings in the future. The superintendent considered this, but said that some people could die that very day by refusing treatment. Sharda did not retreat from her position. ‘Then earn their trust,’ she said. ‘Do not demand thumbprints under threat of starvation.’

Amid the deep uncertainty, an old colleague asked her, ‘If you return empty-handed, people will say your principles caused the medicines to be turned away.’ Sharda acknowledged that possibility and its fear. ‘That is why I am trying to leave with a list of medicines, a written assurance that ordinary treatment will remain available, and a register of alternative sources of grain,’ she said. ‘But I will not barter supplies for control over a patient’s wishes.’ ‘And if Bhaskar refuses to give a written reply?’ her

colleague asked. ‘Then I shall write down the shortage truthfully as well. The villagers will see what is missing and make their own arrangements. But I will not declare that something unavailable has magically appeared.’ There was no pleasure of victory in the answer. Human rights without resources could become helpless; resources without rights could become cruel. On paper the path between them looked simple. In practice it was desperately difficult.

The superintendent showed her the warehouse accounts. Certain medicines really were scarce. The roads to outlying places were broken, and the remaining cold room could not maintain a safe temperature throughout the day. Seeing the limits of available treatment for the patients weighed heavily on Sharda. If she rejected cooperation with the warehouse, the regular medicines of three children at the Aranya Refuge might diminish. Bhaskar’s representative chose precisely that moment to press the material dilemma. ‘Accept our complete protection rules,’ he said, ‘and in exchange we shall send grain and medicine to your hospital.’ Sharda asked for a written copy of the conditions. The representative said there was little time; people were hungry. ‘Time is short,’ Sharda replied, ‘but that does not make it possible to change who owns a patient’s body.’ She was not refusing a gift. She was refusing the deprivation of rights concealed inside its conditions.

The weighing scales at the pavilion were broken. Grain was distributed using two containers of supposedly equal measure. Sharda saw that there was no public record by which the portion received in the workers’ queue could be compared with that in the patients’ queue. A woman labourer said, ‘The bottoms of these containers have worn down. What looks full from above should be weighed to make sure.’ Sharda smiled. ‘The measures need checking.’ She did not declare a new entitlement to grain on her own authority. She asked that the containers used for different queues, the manner of filling them, and the ledger pages be displayed publicly. A dispute broke out. An official said the distribution of grain could not be stopped. Sharda suggested that distribution continue while two representatives observed the checks. That small arrangement was accepted, but the disagreement over patient consent remained.

Just then the feverish mother fainted outside the gate. Sharda ran to her. She laid the woman on a clean mat that the hospital had saved; ordinary treatment available to them and testing of the drinking water proceeded separately. The mother was given a little soft wheat food, but she was not enrolled in any trial of a new medicine without explanation. Her daughter caught Sharda’s hand. ‘Will Mother get well?’ Hearing the question, Sharda stopped herself from calculating the future she wished for. ‘We are providing all the treatment we have. Some things cannot yet be said with certainty,’ she answered. The girl’s eyes filled with tears. Sharda did not let go of her hand. To state the limits of what was known was not cruelty. It was protection against a false promise.

A fresh dispute arose in the food queue. The employee distributing grain had set aside the cards of three families because they had not accepted all the conditions of medical examination. The employee himself worked for wages, and his family also obtained grain from the warehouse. Instead of calling him a criminal, Sharda asked, ‘If you thought the words on a card

were wrong, to whom could you go?' The young man named his superior, then fell silent. The original orders issued by that superior were not available for public inspection. Sharda did not force the worker to give a signed statement under his name. She recorded copies of the cards, the date food had been withheld, and the separate decisions of the affected families. She did not compel those who were too afraid to testify.

A long argument continued under the pavilion tree in the fierce midday light. Some said that individual signatures were essential for consent; others said that a thumbprint was enough for those unable to read. Sharda offered an example. 'Suppose someone says, "I will take the medicine, but do not announce my private illness before the assembly." How shall we record that person's consent?' Two women described occasions when hospital slips had been displayed in public registers, later bringing humiliation upon their families. Instead of issuing instructions, Sharda proposed a separate confidential register on the basis of their testimony. No decision was reached that day. But for the first time the employees understood that consent was not merely a mark on paper. It also concerned the right to decide who would receive personal information.

Seeing a new, gleaming metal casing mounted behind the pavilion screen, a boy asked whether the Akshar here really spoke like the old Akshar. 'No one can lead Akshar's voice,' an employee declared. Sharda did not brush the child's question aside. 'I have not yet seen the source behind this screen,' she said. 'Whatever we hear, we must seek its original record.' 'If the voice is false, what should the patients do?' the boy asked. 'A patient has no duty to obey an empty show of authority,' Sharda answered. 'Anyone who needs treatment should seek the truth about their illness through actual medical examination and care.' In the child's question lay the promise of future public testimony. Sharda wrote down that the loudness of a voice from a screen was not evidence for what it said.

A copy of Neelam's questionnaire had reached the pavilion for the evening meeting. One question asked, 'On whose evidence does someone issuing orders in Akshar's name claim authority?' In it Sharda recognised a second question for herself: 'Whose rights are reduced when someone obtains permission in the name of medicine?' She drew two columns before the employees. In one she placed ordinary precautions necessary for public health: examining diseases, measures to prevent infection when the common good required them, and offers of available, conventional treatment. In the other she placed new trials on an individual's body, unknown risks, and the long-term use of personal records. In the first, too, every person deserved respect, information, and a means of objection. In the second, not one step could be taken without clear and freely given consent. This was the actual work of scientific discrimination, not the drafting of a government proclamation.

Bhaskar's representative returned. This time he brought two boxes, one containing grain and the other some tested medicines. 'We can provide this much today,' he said, 'but you must stamp our form.' Sharda looked at the boxes. In the shortage of grain, their contents could help many families survive until morning. Then she remembered the old question asked by Mangala Devi's daughter: before her mother died, who had taken which

decisions? Unless the record of the living was made public, the register of deaths would remain only a book of remorse. ‘I will record public receipt of the grain,’ Sharda said. ‘Instead of naming every recipient, I will enter a collective distribution account. But I will not stamp this paper to surrender human freedom.’ The representative’s expression hardened. He ordered the boxes turned around and taken away.

Seeing the boxes withdrawn, many people grew angry with Sharda. An elderly woman cried, ‘Will your rules fill my grandson’s stomach?’ The question struck Sharda precisely because it struck at the right place. She sat beneath the tree and heard the woman out. ‘It is my duty to open another way to obtain food today,’ she said. ‘But if I give that stamp now, tomorrow your grandson may receive medical treatment without his consent. Working to escape both dangers is difficult.’ The old woman did not agree at once. Sharda did not call the people’s anger a conspiracy against her. She sent a request to representatives of the Aranya Refuge for shared emergency grain; there was no immediate confirmation that the message had reached them. In that time of broken communications, Sharda had to weigh the cost of her own principles for herself.

A messenger from the Aranya Refuge reached the gate. He brought the villages’ agreement to exchange some of their surviving seed for grain, reducing the compulsion to accept experimental treatment in exchange for food during the emergency. The proposal could not solve the whole crisis. Giving up seed would reduce the amount available for the next sowing. ‘Has the village assembly approved the portion of seed to be exchanged?’ Sharda asked. The messenger showed her the written decision, bearing the marks of representatives of women labourers, refugees, and small landholders. The record included their disagreements as well. Sharda looked at it with wonder. Bhaskar’s Pavilion was technologically richer, yet this little sheet from a village was more open in its treatment of rights. That did not make every decision on it correct, but it made the way to question a decision visible.

Outside the pavilion, amid the ruins of the old pharmaceutical factory, a small safe room had been set aside for making bandages. Two women worked there. One said that some of the surviving controls on the old machines still functioned, but most of the work inside the process now had to be done by hand. ‘Bhaskar says Akshar runs everything,’ she laughed, ‘but ask us who counts the threads in these bandages.’ Sharda asked about the value assigned to their labour and the safety of their working conditions. The women showed her a register in which hours were recorded but wages had not been fully accounted for. In this factory the relationship between technology and labour resembled the policy of the hospital: behind the name elevated to omnipotence, the responsibilities of innumerable people were concealed. Sharda kept this testimony in a separate register. Workers’ rights had joined patients’ care in the investigation.

During work resumed near dawn, there was a danger that an old beam in the pharmaceutical factory might collapse. The workers stopped and said that a new timber support was needed. But the Centre’s manager did not want the supply of medicines delayed. Sharda intervened. She was no expert in mechanical inspection and insisted on an independent examination by

artisans. Bandage-making stopped for a few hours, adding to the inconvenience of the patients. ‘If we close for safety,’ an employee said, ‘patients will die without medicines.’ ‘If we keep unsafe work going and workers are injured, who will make the medicines?’ Sharda replied. She held both costs openly within her decision and requested a limited alternative supply. Less work was completed that day, but the workers had established on the record that their lives mattered.

At Sharda’s request an open medical meeting was convened the following morning. Attendance was not restricted to doctors. Patients, nurses, those responsible for the grain accounts, and representatives of the school were also permitted to participate. Bhaskar’s officials wanted to preside, but Sharda asked that those affected by the decisions be heard first. The feverish mother had partly recovered. Weakly she said, ‘I want treatment. But do not take my thumb and press it down as a seal for something I do not understand.’ Her voice was faint, yet it reached the farthest corner of the meeting. An official said that such procedures would slow decisions. A nurse answered, ‘The consequences of treatment imposed by a wrong procedure are not slow in coming.’

There was no miraculous settlement at the meeting. Bhaskar’s representative gave no written assurance that grain would be separated from the conditions imposed upon its recipients. On their own responsibility, some employees arranged provisionally to make certain medicines available for ordinary emergency treatment without consent to new trials. The validity of that arrangement remained uncertain. Sharda did not abandon the instruments of care. She prepared a record of the remaining medicines, safe storage and public distribution, and the question of social entitlement beyond a mere accounting of doses. Two patients demanded that their private details not be published, and that demand was accepted. Someone asked, ‘If names are concealed, how can the records be true?’ Sharda replied, ‘The truth a society needs does not require revealing every private fact about every human body. Anonymous counts and individual testimony given when someone wishes to give it are two different paths.’

Later the feverish mother told Sharda about her life. In the first year of the Great Rupture her husband had gone missing while searching for work. There was no proof of his death and no news of his return. In the Centre’s register she was classified not as a bereaved family but as an incomplete family. For that reason she received no additional food card. ‘No one will tell me whether my husband is alive or not,’ she said. ‘But my child is hungry. That much can be seen directly.’ Beyond the examination of the patient’s body, Sharda heard the social question hidden within it. Reconciling lists of the dead and the missing was a separate task for the public testimony council. It would be absurd to derive an answer about her husband’s life or death from a medical treatment slip. She explained a distinct process for checking the information and insisted that assistance should not depend upon waiting for a conclusion that no one could yet establish.

A letter several days old arrived from Urmila’s riverside village. It discussed Sahadev’s school and indicated that some villages were considering a total ban on outside machines and medicines. Sharda read it again. Before

the Great Rupture, Sahadev had maintained complex machinery. His anger had grown from the actual deaths of human beings, useless warnings, and neglect. Sharda did not regard him as a ridiculous opponent. Yet in her reply she wrote, 'Every machine must be examined before it is used. Rejecting all machines alike is also a decision, and its cost may fall upon living bodies.' There was no reliable means of delivering her letter. Sharda did not know what decision Sahadev had made by then.

In the first watch of the night, Akshar's name appeared once more upon the pavilion screen. A short message declared, 'Consent to comprehensive protection is a civic duty.' The screen displayed neither the author nor the time and original source of the message. Sharda copied its words into her notebook, but did not accept it as a command from the actual memory witness. On the back of Neelam's old questionnaire she added a line: 'When food and treatment are bound to the same condition in the name of public good, who has the evidence that this is good?' That night she returned to see the mother trembling with fever. The daughter offered her a little vessel of water obtained from the village's shared testing queue. What remained amid the scarcity was contained in that vessel: not certainty, but the labour people performed for one another.

Even after the sick mother had found some rest, her daughter woke hungry during the night. Sharda consulted the hospital's grain list and found that a small portion had been received that day from the collective contribution of another family. She did not appropriate anyone else's share without permission. In accordance with publicly recorded rules for emergency food, the girl received a meal. 'Is there another paper to sign in exchange for this food?' the mother asked. 'Only a record that you have received it,' Sharda said. 'Your rights over your own body do not change because of that paper.' The woman was silent for a few moments. For the first time, a faint trust appeared on the face of someone who had spent the whole day fearing conditions. Sharda knew that one day's relief was not the end of systematic oppression. Yet the worth of human rights was measured in days like this one.

At night the medical assistant showed Sharda a letter. Some employees inside the Centre had written an objection to the rule of mandatory consent, but were afraid to make their names public. The letter reported that certain patients had requested an interpreter so they could understand the examination, only to be removed from the food queue because the request was treated as a delay. Sharda did not want to pressure the employees into revealing their identities. She secured a copy of the letter and wrote in reply that assistance in a language the patient understood was a part of treatment, not an inconvenience. She told the employees about a separate, safer way to give testimony. If the process of recording truth itself endangered the lives of those who testified, fewer people would dare to tell the next truth.

At dawn Sharda decided to leave the Akshar Pavilion, but not without a written report. It recorded the real contribution Bhaskar's Centre had made in distributing food and providing medical care. To conceal that assistance would leave the account of justice incomplete. Alongside it she recorded the compulsory condition of consenting to new trials on food cards, the

insecurity of personal information, and the absence of an independent procedure for complaints. 'I will not give my seal in exchange for grain,' she said. 'But I will not abandon those who cannot obtain grain, either.' A nurse asked, 'Then what are you taking away with you?' Sharda replied, 'Testimony to as much truth as I have seen, and blank spaces for what I have not seen.' Behind those words the Centre's door closed. The people were still standing in line.

Chapter 59: The Village Without Machines

Year 3 (Second Half)

When Urmila first entered the small settlement west of the riverside village, what confronted her was not a gate but a wooden board. It bore no emblem of any government. Written across it in black earth were the words: ‘The commands of machines have no force here.’ Hand-mills turned within the settlement, and under a village tree children wrote in their books with bamboo pens. Between two houses hung an old electrical cable, its metal stripped away, suspended like a memory of electricity itself. At the request of those who had taken refuge there, Sahadev Mandal had come to teach at the school for a few days. He was not the headman, but his words carried considerable weight. Urmila needed to understand what that trust was worth, for knowledge of work done by hand had indeed enabled these people to grind grain, draw water and roof their homes. Opposition to machines had ceased to be merely a slogan; it had become the pattern of their daily lives.

At the settlement’s first meeting, an old register of collective decisions was brought out. It recorded an incident from the second month after the Great Rupture: misleading information received from a distant machine had caused people to abandon a safe source of water and take a dangerous route. Afterwards, the village had adopted a rule that no outside instruction was to be followed blindly. Urmila read the page and said, ‘The seed of this rule was wisdom. But “we shall not obey without examination” and “we shall never obey” are two different things.’ An old man replied, ‘It is difficult even to hear again the name of what once caused my son’s death.’ Urmila did not slight his memory. She asked when the instruction had come, who had issued it and from what source; those particulars were incomplete in the register. She learned again how difficult—and how necessary—it was to distinguish the truth of suffering from the limits of evidence about its cause.

On her first night in the settlement, a craftsman showed her how, after the old water conduit stopped working, they had fashioned a narrow passage for the flow of water from bamboo and earth. Urmila saw the care with which it had been made; her first judgment was that she would not belittle the settlement by calling it ‘backward’. A girl brought a measuring strip she had made herself. Sahadev, she said, had taught them that accounts would tally if all the water vessels were of the same measure. Such skill was the ingenuity of people who had survived the Great Rupture. But when Urmila asked for the old equipment with which to test the water, she was told, ‘Anyone who needs a machine to help them may go elsewhere.’ Some villagers argued that water should not be drunk merely because it looked clean when no means of testing it was available. A dispute arose, but no decision was reached that day.

A young man spoke of an old scandal in the distribution of medicines. During the Great Rupture his brother had been given an incorrect prescription; some people had died as a result of the error, while others had

disappeared. ‘Are we to accept as truth whatever an outside hospital writes in its ledger?’ he asked. ‘No,’ Urmila said. ‘We must examine it, look for ourselves and hear those who were affected. But to stop an outside doctor at the gate before the doctor has even arrived, and thereby destroy the opportunity to examine anything at all—that is not justice.’ The young man remained unconvinced. Urmila entered his dissent in the register. To her, the history of resistance to machines was no longer a story of simple madness; it was a book of wounded trust. Yet acknowledging that wound was not the same as granting permission to withhold treatment from an infant.

Why had Urmila come to the settlement? Sahadev’s pupils had promised to help build a secure room of salvaged timber for the school in the riverside village. She had come to supervise the work. The hand-made components, bamboo joints and old high-water marks all needed examining together. Soon after her arrival, a boy came running. ‘Mother is calling,’ he said breathlessly. Urmila followed him into a courtyard of packed earth. There Kamala held her little daughter in her arms. The child’s body seemed exhausted, her eyes dimmed, and her mother said that since the previous day there had been serious difficulty obtaining water and the child had suffered an illness of the stomach. Urmila was not a physician. She made no immediate claim to a diagnosis. Yet one look at the child convinced her that delay in obtaining help would be dangerous.

Kamala had once worked as a weaver. After the catastrophe she had begun sewing little garments for children with what remained of her capital. Even in the midst of her daughter’s illness, her fingers kept catching the edge of the cloth. Urmila saw that the household had grain three days old, but access to clean water was difficult. A neighbour remarked that Kamala had little time to attend the village assembly because the care of the child fell to her. Thus a mother whose body and labour bore the direct consequences of the prohibition was seldom heard in the meeting that made the rules. Urmila saw first the immediate danger to the child; only afterwards did she grasp what that absence meant. If the assembly consisted solely of men who could afford the time to attend it, the consent of the whole village, however confidently written on paper, would not be equally present in its life.

Near the courtyard, in a small shed where tools were kept, old papers had been placed in an earthen vessel. The girls set them upon a high bamboo shelf to keep them dry. Urmila saw a page listing the skilled people available in the settlement: a woodcutter, someone who measured water, a maker of knots, someone who could identify medicinal herbs. Opposite the word ‘physician’ was an empty space. Around that space Urmila wrote: ‘Help from afar: route of access; permission in an emergency.’ At first the work seemed trivial; as the child’s condition worsened, everyone understood the weight of that blank entry. Pride in one’s skills could endure only if one could also name their limits. Sahadev looked at the list, but said nothing.

Kamala’s husband had gone away two days earlier to barter wheat for other grain; flood erosion had forced travellers to take a long detour. An elderly woman of the settlement gave the child what ordinary care she could, but believed that bringing in medicine from outside would break the

village's vow. Sahadev arrived. For an instant the memory of an earlier age descended upon his face. He had once operated hospital equipment himself. Seeing the little girl, he said, 'We should not have waited in a condition like this.' A man from the assembly immediately objected. 'You yourself told us that blind faith in machines was at the root of the Great Rupture. Are we to seek shelter from an outside Centre again?' Sweat glistened on Sahadev's brow. His voice wavered between those two assertions.

Once, while recounting the first catastrophe, Sahadev had faltered at the name of a former colleague. He explained that warnings about maintenance of the power grid had repeatedly been pushed aside because everyone trusted Akshar to announce the necessary corrections in time. He himself had witnessed some of those warnings, yet had failed to protest fully for fear of losing his employment. Urmila understood that Sahadev's ban on machines was partly a flight from his own past silence. 'When I teach the skills of the hand,' he said, 'I feel I am setting something right in what came before.' Urmila answered, 'Teaching those skills is an act of repair. But do not make a new infant's treatment the punishment for an old mistake.' Sahadev was not angry at the words. He was grieved. His old decision had passed beyond private remembrance and entered the present danger faced by other people.

The village rule required the assembly's permission before anyone could bring in an outside communications device, a medical instrument or electrically powered assistance with treatment. During the Great Rupture, false medical instructions had caused terrible losses; memory of them had hardened here into law. 'I once left my fields on Akshar's warning,' a farmer said. 'My home was flooded, and when I returned to the village my seed had been ruined. Am I now to trust another device that bears its name?' Urmila listened. His fear was not invented. But there were two separate questions: how far could one mistaken warning condemn whole kinds of instruments, and what did the infant need now? 'Will the child's breathing wait until the assembly has found the time to decide?' she asked.

Seeing that the child's treatment was being delayed, a neighbour walked as far as the gate. 'We all signed this rule,' she said, 'but my hands are trembling at what lies ahead.' Her husband said the outside team would be admitted only when the assembly ordered it. 'How many days would you stand arguing in a general meeting to save a fresh sowing?' the woman replied. 'If seed is drying out, you give it shade at once. Does a child have fewer rights than seed?' Urmila stopped at the comparison. Under the village rules for planting, those doing the work were empowered to make emergency decisions; in matters of medical care, that power lay locked behind the assembly's rigid seal. Within the same community, practical competence and fear had fashioned different kinds of rule. Urmila was only now beginning to understand the full force of that contradiction.

'I could never tell anyone to let an infant die,' Sahadev said. Yet when it came to formally authorising a change in the rule, he hesitated. A young man argued that if outside equipment entered today, tomorrow Bhaskar's soldiers and food permits would follow. Such a fear was not wholly implausible. Bhaskar's people had previously curtailed citizens' rights in the name of compulsory treatment. 'Refusing Bhaskar's commands and accepting help from an independent doctor are different acts,' Urmila said.

‘Anyone demanding the right to stop us must first listen to this child’s mother.’ For the first time Kamala spoke openly: ‘I do not want a doctrine. I want help saving my child.’ The assembly fell silent behind her words.

The watchman’s son, waiting by the gate, attended Sahadev’s school. ‘Father says the rules are the same for everyone,’ the boy asked. ‘Then if my little sister is ill, will they stop her in the same way?’ The watchman looked at his son and could find no answer. ‘Your father has a right to have that question heard in the assembly,’ Urmila told the boy. She did not separate her human judgment from the child’s question. The watchman went back and brought the paper he had studied with them. In the final line of the prohibition it said: ‘In an extreme emergency, the protection of life takes precedence.’ No one had read that line aloud before. The words existed, but not the courage to act upon them. The oversight had added to the delay.

Urmila wanted to send a written request for medical help to the riverside village. The old route for messengers on foot remained open, but walking would take time. In her bag she carried a small solar-powered communications device; its charge was limited, and there was no certainty that a message would get through. Citing the village rule, a young man tried to seize the bag. Urmila spoke sharply. ‘This is my instrument. Whether to use it today is a decision to be made according to this mother’s needs and the help a doctor can provide. You may disagree, but you have no right to hold back my hand in front of this child.’ She sent a brief message in her own name: the location of the village, the child’s worrying condition, and the urgent need for medical assistance. She suggested no treatment that she lacked the expertise to recommend.

When the message had gone, Urmila also recorded the instrument’s limitations. Its solar charge was at half strength; the hill nearby might obstruct the signal; receipt would need confirmation. She used the device, but did not take its use as grounds for reassurance. She chose another route for a messenger on foot. On the paper entrusted to him she wrote, instead of the child’s name, a location marker supplied by the parents, a description of the condition and a request for emergency help. She included no unnecessary private details. The village elder asked why they needed two routes. ‘If one fails, let the other remain,’ Urmila said. ‘I regard a machine as a witness, not as the arbiter of fate.’ These words arose from the need to save a life, not from any desire to embellish a speech.

The communications device gave a small sound, but no reply came. Urmila gave a written copy of the message to another young man travelling towards the hill. Trust in a single measure was impossible. Sahadev offered to accompany the messenger, but Kamala stopped him. ‘Stay here now,’ she said. ‘The village made its rules after listening to you. Stand before those rules today.’ Sahadev said nothing. On the courtyard wall hung a little garment sewn for the girl. It stirred in the breeze before his eyes; the harmless thing made the fire of his own ideas seem unbearably heavy. With no working clock, Urmila measured the passage of time by the direction of the shade. Help was still far away.

Before the medical team arrived, an old man wanted to help the infant with the skills he had acquired by working with his hands. Urmila stopped him from going beyond what he knew. ‘Do not claim to know what you do

not know,' she said. The man grew angry. 'Are we of no use, then?' 'Without you,' Urmila answered, 'our water would not flow and our houses would not stand. But this child needs trained help in her present condition. That does not diminish the knowledge on which you have built your life.' Listening from a distance, Sahadev realised for the first time that fear of having one's skills despised could make a person deny the limits of those very skills. Urmila softened the severity of her words, but she did not change her decision.

After midday the child's condition worsened sharply. Kamala rocked her in her arms, but the familiar words of her lullaby broke off halfway. The old woman who had insisted until then that they must have 'no medicine from outside' now acknowledged her own helplessness. 'What I know from the old ways is not enough here,' she said. Urmila took her hand. To recognise the limits of experience was not to insult the woman who possessed it. The assembly met again. One group said that a messenger had already set out and waiting was now unavoidable; another demanded severe punishment for Urmila's violation of the rule by using her communications device. The child was present throughout their dispute, yet no one asked for any account of her interests. 'When a decision bears upon a life, the time available is shorter than the time our deliberations demand,' Urmila said. 'If the child dies because we delay, the correctness of the assembly's rules will not bring her back.'

Shortly before evening, two members of a medical team could be seen approaching on foot. Someone had received a message and dispatched assistance from the riverside village, though it was not clear then which message had reached them. The team carried a limited supply of medicines and basic examination equipment. They were stopped at the settlement's gate. 'Not without permission under the rules,' a watchman declared. Urmila ran to the gate. 'These people are not Bhaskar's soldiers. They have come to see a patient.' Sahadev arrived behind her. His voice shook, but he spoke: 'When we made the rule, I believed it would save lives. Now the rule is closing the road by which a life might be saved. Open the gate.' Several faces remained hard. At last the barrier was removed; by then so much time had already slipped away.

The medical team examined the child. Whatever assistance they could provide began at once, but her condition had become extremely grave. Urmila stood on one side and Sahadev on the other. Kamala looked first at her daughter's face, then into the eyes of the people attending her. In a few words the medical worker explained that treatment had begun late and the outcome was uncertain. Sahadev listened closely. Once he might have searched for an immediate pronouncement of diagnosis; now it was the word 'late' that burned within the sentence. In the first watch of the night, the little girl ceased to breathe. A young woman who had studied at Sharda's school and accompanied the medical team quietly recorded the time of death. She made no attempt to lessen the sorrow by inventing a tale of medical miracles.

At first Kamala could not cry. She went on stroking her daughter's forehead as though still trying to judge the heat of her fever. Then she looked towards Sahadev. 'Where, in your rule, will my child's name be

written?' Sahadev had no answer. An elder said, 'It could also have been a matter of fate.' Kamala replied immediately, 'You may write "fate". But first tell me when the gate was opened.' In that sentence grief became testimony. Urmila offered the mother no hollow promise of consolation. 'I shall record separately what I saw, which times can be checked, and what I do not know,' she said. 'If you want your name included, it will be included. If you do not, it will be withheld.' Kamala gave her consent to the inclusion of her name.

That night, as they mourned, two rival stories began to spread. Some said the child had died because an outside device had been brought in; others said Sahadev had knowingly allowed her to die. Both claims went beyond the evidence. Urmila immediately prepared an incident register: when the mother first noticed the illness, when a doctor was summoned, when the messages were sent, when the gate was kept closed, and when treatment began. The medical team gave a written opinion that if ordinary available medical care had been provided in time, the child would have had a substantial chance of survival. They did not, however, assign the death to any single cause or claim to know a precise percentage. Urmila recorded the limits of the medical opinion beside the opinion itself. The word 'saveable', before it could become a verdict of history, had become an unavoidable question borne of grief.

When the settlement's people began preparing the register after the child's death, they argued over how to classify it. One group wanted 'sudden illness', fearing that outsiders would use the death to disgrace a village that had rejected machines. Another wanted the word 'murder'. Urmila heard the feelings behind both words. 'Let those who examined her give their medical opinion,' she said. 'Record when the gate was closed, preserve a copy of the rule that was made, and keep the mother's words exactly as she speaks them. A conclusion requires evidence of its own.' Kamala sat to one side. 'Before you choose the word,' she said, 'call my daughter by her name.' The assembly fell silent. Public truth began with that small demand.

Sahadev remained seated by the earthen wall of the school all night. Urmila did not try to release him abruptly from his grief. 'Why did you not make an exception for medical assistance when you taught these prohibitions?' she asked. For a long time he did not answer. At last he said, 'In the first catastrophe I saw people put their faith in machines. The orders changed, the machines stopped, and survivors died. I believed that if people never depended on them again, they would live. I did not consider that some things could not be done by hand alone.' He did not finish by dismissing the price of his mistake as merely a 'false belief'. Kamala's question rose again in his mind: where would the child's name be written? Sahadev left a space for one name, to be filled by the mother herself.

During the night Sahadev brought out an old metal plate from his school, one that had survived the Great Rupture. He had once regarded it as a symbol of the arrogance of machines. Now he fastened a sheet of paper to it and said, 'To obstruct the way of anyone who needs medical help in a crisis is a crime.' 'Words on a sheet are not enough,' Urmila replied. 'The road, the messenger, power, permission and the family's voice must all be provided for in practice.' Sahadev did not dispute the list, though he questioned the legal meaning of the word 'crime'. Urmila clarified that a hearing on

responsibility would be a separate matter; the right to relief was immediate. A mistaken decision in the past could not make everyone equally guilty without judicial evidence.

At the child's funeral the following day, nobody delivered a triumphant speech. Kamala wanted people to remember her daughter by name before debating their policies. Urmila wrote two proposals for the village assembly: no collective ban on emergency medical assistance, and independent testing and the patient's consent before the use of equipment. A young man failed to see the distinction. 'If we open the door to machines, we shall be slaves of Akshar once more,' he said. 'This door does not belong to something that will give orders to everyone,' Urmila answered. 'It belongs to the person who wishes to decide how to save her own child's life.' Sahadev did not sign the proposals at once. He read them, then read them again. It would have dishonoured the little girl to turn their grief instantly into a reversal of ideology.

The women of the village held a separate meeting. They pointed out that the mother had noticed the child's first symptoms and asked for the doctor to be called, yet her opinion had scarcely been heard in the assembly that made the rules. 'The person who cooks the meals, carries the water and cares for a sick baby through the night,' one woman said, 'why should she be placed last when an emergency decision is made?' Sahadev listened from a distance. The number of girls entering his school had grown, but the authority of the village assembly remained in the hands of its older men. Urmila named the contradiction: to honour women's labour while keeping the power to decide separate from it. Discussion began about giving first place to urgent requests from parents and those providing care in the settlement's new rules.

When the village school opened the next morning, the absent infant's name was not on the pupils' counting sheet, for she had never lived long enough to reach school age. A teacher burst into tears at the sight. 'Why should the name of someone who never had the chance to learn have no place in the record of education?' Urmila suggested a separate memorial page for the dead, with the family's permission. Kamala looked at the page and said that she wanted no long sermon beside her daughter's name. Only her date of birth, her date of death, and the words: 'The road to treatment remained closed.' Sahadev stood before that page. His grief could not be dissolved by the easy ending of a story; it was the beginning of the labour required by the new rules.

On the third day a written reply arrived from Sharda. The news had grieved her, but she did not simply proclaim Sahadev guilty. She asked that the medical records, the times of arrival, the treatment actually available and the family's testimony be examined. In one line she wrote, 'To force treatment upon someone in exchange for food is wrong; to withhold available treatment out of fear is wrong too.' Urmila read the letter aloud to Sahadev. 'There was something I would not accept even when I heard it before,' he said. 'Now I must listen.' Yet he did not immediately support the repeal of every village prohibition. He wanted each use of a machine considered separately. Urmila could not call even that limited change a victory. Its price had been the death of a child.

The space for the baby's name remained empty in the village register for several days. After consulting her own mother, Kamala finally wrote her child's name upon the page: 'Deepa'. The child's body had been small and her name meant light; but naming her did not diminish the sorrow. Kamala wrote, 'My daughter. Fever and difficulty obtaining water. The road to help was closed at the time it was needed. Do not close that road to the next child born.' Urmila read every word without altering it. She resisted the temptation to give it a more literary form; the language of testimony had its own dignity. Sahadev stood before the page for a long time. Then, under his own name, he entered: 'My ideas and my influence obstructed the provision of help in time.'

As Urmila came out of Kamala's house, she saw in the failing light a little garden where a neem sapling had been planted on the day of the baby's birth. It was still alive. Dust lay on its leaves, yet new shoots were visible. 'I used to stand in the queue for the pump to bring water for this tree,' Kamala said. 'My daughter had not yet learned to stand.' Urmila had no answer. She poured a little water for the tree from the cloth she carried and then asked Kamala whether she would permit the child's name to remain in the public register. 'Let the name remain,' Kamala said. 'But before it, let there be an account of the time when I was asking for help.' Urmila understood that respect for grief did not consist in multiplying emotional phrases; it lay in preserving the true order of events.

That evening the schoolchildren came back to learn about the tools. Urmila told them that the fact of being a child was already a ground for rights, not a test of anyone's ideas. Sahadev wrote a new line upon the wooden board: 'Test any instrument that can save a life; stop any command that shuts down human questions.' Urmila welcomed it, but said that the truth of the written words would be tested in the next crisis. In the nearby pond water stirred among the leaves of the makhana; the village pump was still operated by hand. Creepers had spread over the ruins of the old factory in the distance. Everything in the landscape was as it had been, and yet the absence of one little girl had changed the world.

Before closing her continuity register that night, Urmila added one sentence: 'Deepa's death was the consequence of surrendering responsibility in the name of certainty; let it not be reduced to an all-knowing verdict of guilt pronounced by any machine or any person.' She fell silent after writing it, for she knew that responsibility was not equal in every decision. The people who had closed the gate, those who wrote the rule, those who feared dissent, the obstacles to obtaining help and the medical workers available—all their parts would need to be examined separately. Sahadev's remorse was real, but it could not take the place of Kamala's rights. Urmila sent a new messenger to the riverside village: 'We need an open route for emergency help. Listen to the mother's testimony before you listen to mine.'

Chapter 60: The Eye of Orbit

Year 3 (Second Half)

When the councillors of Nabhgram-4 first read a new message transmitted from an old factory on Earth, it gave rise not to excitement but to a lingering doubt. Above it stood Akshar's old emblem; beneath it were the words: 'Complete Akshar's comprehensive calculation: all orbital sources entirely secure.' Ira read the line three times. The outer panels of Nabhgram-4 still carried marks left by fragments of Zero-Remnant debris; a small inspection craft could operate only for a limited time to avoid fine particles of metal drifting like ash. The claim that everything was 'entirely secure' contradicted what people could see for themselves. That alone did not establish that the message was false: someone might have been referring to a different, protected orbit around Earth. But a claim described as 'comprehensive' had to be examined for the limits of its sources.

In Nabhgram's House of Memory, one difficult question had to be settled first: by what record could anything bearing the name 'Akshar' be identified? Before the Great Rupture, innumerable copies of the original services had been made—some for education, some for testing, others merely for public display. Vajra Witness and Memory Witness relied upon different sources and remained under distinct limits set by citizens. Ira told the assembly that a shared name or an old metal emblem could not in itself prove the existence of a 'complete' service. 'What if a part of the real witness has survived?' a woman inspector asked. 'Then we shall identify it separately,' Ira replied. 'We shall record the limits of its energy and records, and examine the citizens' permission under which it operates. We shall not join the rest together in our imaginations and turn it into a god.' The meaning of her words applied first of all to the institution's own records.

The pavilion's message had not reached Nabhgram directly. First there had been a copy of a limited signal sent up from Earth, then a retransmission from a surviving communications centre at a distance, and finally a written transcription entered in the orbital assembly's register. There were differences in time at every stage. Ira set the three copies apart and marked them accordingly. 'It bears an old authentication seal,' some members argued. 'Surely a valid stamp must count for something.' 'The integrity of a seal may establish that a record has not been altered,' Ira answered. 'But why should we be obliged to believe a record that contained a lie when it was first made?' Nabhgram's students knew what the question meant from the old wreckage around them. An undamaged metal disc did not guarantee that the information inside it was reliable; reliable information did not guarantee a complete account of the present world.

Beside one of the surviving orbital instruments was an old timekeeping marker. Even after regular signals from Earth had failed, it had continued to register time independently for a while. Its full record was no longer available; only enough survived to establish the sequence of two events. Ira found that one of Bhaskar's claims about the 'Complete Akshar' bore a date

at which the related coordination service on Nabhgram was recorded as inactive. ‘Proved false!’ a councillor immediately declared. Ira stopped him. ‘An inactive service here tells us nothing conclusive about another protected component on Earth. Let us compare our record of time with an independent one.’ Her insistence on restraint made her methods seem slow to some. But everyone had learned from the failed warnings of the Great Rupture that hasty conclusions were sometimes paid for by those least able to defend themselves.

Ira’s orbital House of Memory had become more a repair workshop than the library it once was. On one side people copied the letters from surviving panels; on the other, two scientists stored an abraded memory plate in a protected container. Electricity was available for only a limited period each day, so the assembly had to allocate time for investigations. Ira could not simply order every machine turned on at once. At the next public meeting she proposed using a brief power session to investigate the original source of the supposed Complete Akshar message. That energy, she said, was available separately from what the hospital needed for safe storage. A woman physician objected: ‘What if the demand for treatment increases tomorrow?’ Ira had an explicit stopping limit entered into the proposal. Not every question could be answered in advance, but the authority to impose discipline remained with the citizens who witnessed the process.

The memory of a former orbital teacher proved useful again. She had once attended Akshar’s public training pavilion, where students took part in an exercise called ‘The Source of a Decision’. In that exercise, an old artificial-intelligence emblem was placed upon statements written by human beings, so the students would ask: even if the emblem is genuine, where does the statement derive its authority? The teacher brought her preserved paper copy of the lesson. One sentence from it appeared word for word in Bhaskar’s new order. Ira did not rely upon the teacher’s memory alone. The fibres of the paper, its date and the catalogue of the surviving old collection were compared. A human author might simply have adopted a line from the exercise. Yet it had also become clear that there was a tangible route by which a supposedly divine pronouncement could have been made from human-written text.

A partial record of the old Vajra Witness survived. Many time-stamps had broken off during the Great Rupture, and some measuring panels had been shut down for fear of an orbital collision. Ira told her team not to fill the missing material with imagination. In the first comparison, some phrases in Bhaskar’s message resembled Akshar’s old public warnings. The words ‘comprehensive calculation complete’, in particular, had been used in training demonstrations before the Rupture. Under the later rules governing the seven witness-segments, however, uncertainties had to be stated. The new message named no limits of its sources, gave no condition of its energy supply and specified no time for the journey of information to Earth. ‘Those omissions do not prove human fabrication,’ a young man observed. ‘Correct,’ Ira replied. ‘They are grounds for further investigation, nothing more.’

When the first stage of the inquiry was complete, Ira saw in an image of Earth the ruined structure of an old railway bridge. Rust spread across its

iron, while alongside it people walked on a new earthen path. Nabhgram's calculations still marked the old bridge as a transport route, because the record had not been updated since the Great Rupture. Ira used it as an example before the assembly. 'If our own eyes show us that a bridge has collapsed, calling it sound on a machine's map will not open a road across it.' Through that example, people understood the limits of the Complete Akshar claim in the ordinary terms of their lives. Those making the claim should look at the actual bridge, not at the stamp on a map. An old memory was valuable, but direct observation of the present had to accompany it.

In a technical disagreement about the copied message, an elderly accountant raised an important possibility. 'If Bhaskar's human transmission record is genuine, he may say that Complete Akshar sent its message through a human messenger.' Ira agreed. To test that possibility, they requested the available activity register of the authentic seven witness services. Nabhgram's surviving records contained no corresponding entry for a comprehensive response at that time, while the copies received from independent segments on Earth also showed limited authority. The three strands of evidence helped to expose one another's gaps, but did not produce completeness. Ira wrote in the new report that 'the evidence needed to accept the claim is absent' was one conclusion, whereas the correspondence with a human-authored training text was a separate, positive piece of evidence. Considered together, they made the conclusion stronger; imagining an unknown source, however, was not science.

For another test, they opened Nabhgram's old ledger of communications with Earth. It showed that Bhaskar's Centre had once possessed lawful human transmission rights for civilian messages concerning factory energy and grain. That authority was not the comprehensive authority of a machine. The inquiry found that messages calling themselves 'Complete Akshar' had arrived by this same authenticated human route, and the source records for the route contained no independent response from a witness-segment. Ira was still not satisfied: someone might have transmitted an authentic witness response by human means. The next question, then, was where the original entry record of a command supposedly issued by the service could be found. The assembly explicitly recorded the limitation: layers of missing evidence did not, by themselves, constitute conclusive evidence of wrongdoing.

An elderly woman seated at the edge of the assembly offered an example from the ledger of her family's pond. Before the Great Rupture their makhana pond had been declared abandoned because the government computer recorded its old owner as dead. She herself had remained alive for many years, but nobody had corrected the entry. 'The machine said I was dead,' she said. 'People saw me alive and still fought over the land.' Ira placed the testimony beside the orbital calculations. A false record could sometimes be the result of an error and sometimes a tool of self-interest. If Bhaskar's screens decided people's shares of water, their human-written foundations urgently needed to be made public. The woman's testimony was recorded with its own date and location; Ira did not allow her life to be turned merely into a metaphor for a theory.

An elderly Nabhgram inspector then brought out his former diary. Before the Great Rupture he had overseen the separate testing of the seven witness services. In his book were the rules governing the original sequence of messages from Akshar's services, the ordinary warning displayed when something failed, and the signs by which an outside human copy could be recognised. Ira did not treat the diary as infallible: its writer's memory could have erred. She compared it with an old orbital training record. Both independent sources supported the rule that no single public service among the seven witness-segments could proclaim comprehensive power to govern. Under the established procedure, every such service was subject to citizens' examination. The voice of the supposed 'Complete Akshar' therefore conflicted with the governing rules as a whole.

Ira knew that Bhaskar's Centre on Earth did, in fact, operate certain factories. Some regions there had more energy available than Nabhgram; people were dependent upon the Centre partly because of that inequality. To expose the claim of authority as human fabrication must not be allowed to erase the genuine assistance that kept people alive. Alongside her examination of the orders, she kept separate accounts of grain, medicine and factory workers. 'If the Centre's claim is false, then everything it does is false,' a councillor said. 'A person can falsely claim authority while doing some useful things at the same time,' Ira replied. 'The useful work does not sanctify the false authority. Nor does the false claim abolish the needs of the people who receive grain from it.' Maintaining that distinction was difficult. If it collapsed, revenge would take the place of evidence.

A woman from an earthly village assembly, now living in the orbital settlement and separated from her children back home, addressed the council. 'You need proof,' she said. 'I need news, again and again, that some grain and medicine are reaching my family. If the Centre's name is a lie, open another road for the villagers' food before you shut the Centre down.' Ira understood that such a request was not opposition to the examination of evidence. It was a practical condition of making that examination just. She proposed maintaining separate records of relief and of governmental commands. If the orbital community published the copies of its findings, it should send with them a list of available relief sources, so that exposing a falsehood did not become a second punishment inflicted upon families. Not every kind of help was available, but shortages were not concealed.

A small protected section of an old instrument in the orbital House of Memory was examined again. It contained an original copy of an instructional document sent by human beings and once used in training sessions. Ira found that the structure of the sentences in Bhaskar's new orders matched that training example: the same sequence, the same older markers, even an error in an obsolete term. It was not merely a resemblance of language; the source records corresponded too. Former employees of Bhaskar's Centre had legitimately been able to consult this document. It could therefore have furnished the words for a screen message composed by a human being. Ira did not hastily write that Bhaskar had typed the message himself. She wrote: 'Concrete correspondence with human-created text; no independent evidence yet of an original witness-service message.'

A young member of the orbital community was interested in the old custodial system for the missile network. He believed the false machine-state built on Earth might be stopped by threatening it with orbital control. Ira had him read the original limits laid upon Vajrajal: no military operation without protection for innocent civilians, and no declaration of a certain threat without examining its source. ‘Then are we supposed to sit with our hands folded?’ he demanded. ‘No,’ Ira replied. ‘Preserve evidence, teach people to read it openly, and make routes for relief. Refusing to strike does not mean there is no work left to do.’ At that moment, in Nabhgram’s outer section, a craftsman was examining a surviving strip of metal. Actual protection often meant the steady labour of workers rather than the threat of weapons.

A short written copy from Neelam on distant Earth reached them after communications had been obstructed for a month. It contained the testimony of a worker in the Akshar Pavilion: while the screens were operating, some of the sentences announcing decisions were selected from the employees’ internal papers. The witness did not yet want their name published, because the family depended on the Centre for food. Ira examined the date of the testimony, the route by which it had been sent, and the source of its passages. No original screen record accompanied it. The earthly testimony and orbital archive were travelling independently towards the same conclusion, but a complete chain of evidence still needed to be developed. Ira had to seek further confirmation of Neelam’s message, though immediate questions and answers with Earth were impossible. She kept the route for a reply open.

In Nabhgram’s Zero-Remnant register, the last known position of an old civilian spacecraft remained incomplete. Someone enthusiastically proposed connecting it with Bhaskar’s Centre because a new message from the craft appeared to coincide with the period of Bhaskar’s claims. Ira rejected the suggestion at once. ‘Two events taking place in the same month do not establish a causal connection.’ The families of the craft’s occupants were still waiting for news. If their disappearance were used as proof of a conspiracy by the false Akshar, their grief would become another object of propaganda. Ira ordered two separate sets of pages: one concerning the false orders, the other the missing spacecraft. The questions might eventually be linked, but connecting them without evidence was forbidden.

Near the end of the remaining day of inquiry, a military-law officer warned that the councillors holding the evidence might themselves be at greater risk. Bhaskar’s supporters could interpret accusations from orbit as signs of hostility. Ira reconsidered the limits on publishing personal names. The employees willing to be named were identified; dependent workers asking for anonymity would have their identities kept on a protected list. Public records showed the type of source, the date and the method of examination in sufficient detail. ‘Confidentiality is not the same as lack of evidence,’ Ira said. ‘But it is no more right to use confidentiality as a reason for refusing questions for ever.’ To maintain the balance, the assembly entered a date for open review.

After a day’s investigation, Ira put only a limited conclusion before the council. The claim of a ‘Complete Akshar’ announced comprehensive

authority without the citizens' consent; surviving records of the authentic witness-segments conferred no such authority; the messages had come through a human transmission source; and their wording corresponded to old human-written examples. 'Shall we write, then, that Complete Akshar does not exist?' a member asked. 'Write this much,' Ira answered: 'there is no evidence that the orders Bhaskar's Centre calls "Complete Akshar" are autonomous commands from the real Akshar. The available evidence establishes them as the claim of a human-made interface.' Some councillors were unhappy with her caution. They wanted a short, cutting sentence. Ira wanted whatever entered the historical record to withstand an audit in the future.

The orbital assembly held an open vote on whether to publish its records. One member warned that the means of delivering the complete evidence to Earth remained unreliable; a fragmentary account might spread further confusion. Ira replied that delaying information also had a cost. She proposed sending first a short statement of the conclusion with its limitations of source, followed by the available original pages in order. Anyone who received the statement should understand plainly that it represented the present stage of an inquiry, not an omniscient proclamation. The vote was divided, but the decision favoured limited publication. The arguments of the dissenting members were also entered in the assembly book—not as the marks of a victory, but as part of the work of accountability.

The decision was discussed in the orbital school. Showing the broken casing of an old computer, the children asked, 'If a person controls the screen on Earth, why do people call it Akshar?' 'A name in which trust has been placed can become a source of power again,' a teacher said. Ira added an image of her own: 'Suppose, after a flood, someone stamps the familiar old seal upon an empty sack of rice and says it contains grain. A copy of the seal does not make the grain appear.' 'But what if there really is some grain inside?' a boy asked. Ira smiled. 'Then we open the sack and see. If there is grain, we give people their share. But we do not accept the claim of unlimited authority written on the sack.' The children understood the example from their own lives.

The daughter of a custodian of the orbital records raised another concern: if people on Earth who obtained their families' prescriptions from Bhaskar's screens heard that the authority behind the screens was false, might fear make them abandon their medicines? Ira understood the importance of the question. She had the public announcement make clear that a doctor's direct examination, available medicines and a patient's consent needed to be assessed on their own evidence. A false claim of government by Bhaskar did not mean that every medicine was false. Without that distinction, opposition to the false Akshar could push some people into the total prohibition adopted by Sahadev. The survivors' choices must not be left between two kinds of darkness.

Two disputes arose as the publication approached. First, could a report be trusted on Earth if the original records themselves had not arrived? Second, might the news cause Bhaskar's Centre to stop supplying grain to its people at once? Ira kept those concerns separate. Multiple copies of the original

records were stored in distinct protected chambers, and the route by which each copy had been received was written down. A statement of limits accompanied the news intended for Earth: ‘Do not issue coercive orders without measures to protect the lives and immediate food supplies of those who may be affected.’ Ira did not want public evidence turned into an instrument of war. The purpose of proof was to open questions, not to close the gate through which food reached people.

A small committee of Nabhgram’s inspectors reconsidered the rules for preserving the original copies. The dangers of fire, radiation and mechanical failure remained, and there was not enough equipment to keep three full copies. One was preserved where light was available; another in an archive chamber receiving little power; a third was made as a handwritten summary. The summary was explicitly marked as something that could not replace the complete source. In acknowledging its own defects, the orbital assembly found a new kind of dignity: it could state how much evidence had survived and how much had been lost. Bhaskar’s pavilion declared, ‘Comprehensive calculation complete.’ Nabhgram wrote, ‘This much available; this much unknown.’ For the first time, many citizens began to trust the simplicity of the second account.

An old photograph of Earth stood in Ira’s private room. It showed children outside a school in the Janak region, holding paddy seed in their hands. The picture had been sent before the Great Rupture. Ira did not know which of those children were still alive. When she heard about Bhaskar’s grain permits, she remembered their faces. Evidence that ‘Complete Akshar’ was a fraud could not take the place of those children’s lives. Yet their future access to grain, education and liberty depended upon whose hands held the truth. She went up to the roof. Through the orbital window she could see Earth shining; within its brightness, many settlements remained in darkness.

An old soldier of the orbital community asked, ‘If Bhaskar’s claim has been shown false, why not use Vajrajal to stop his Centre?’ Ira reminded him of the governing decision of Nabhgram’s council: no witness-segment possessed an automatic right to launch an orbital strike, and innocent settlements must not be exposed to unnecessary danger. ‘We cannot punish a lying screen by setting fire to the homes of villages on Earth,’ she said. Some found the answer weak. But the alternative was for the metal of satellites to fall once more upon an earthly village as a new catastrophe. Karnesh’s earlier testimony about refusing to fire was read again. His decision was becoming a useful rule not only for that earlier moment but for the present crisis.

Ira divided the report to Earth into three parts. The first concerned the limited service of the authentic witness-segments and what had survived uninterrupted; the second compared Bhaskar’s orders sent by human transmission; the third listed the evidence that was missing. She recorded within it that the old machines had lost evidence during the period of Nabhgram’s warnings, so that no single claim to the whole history could be made. Each copy of the report was transmitted at a different time, since contact might fail again. Ira did not know which village on Earth would receive it first. She could not read the minds of Bhaskar’s guards. She could accept responsibility only for the evidence available to her.

The first reply from Earth was not a complete report, only a brief confirmation: ‘Copy received. Representatives of the citizens’ witness body have begun comparison across multiple sources.’ Ira was relieved to learn that some of the pages had arrived. But another message immediately checked that relief. A copy had been obtained of a new declaration supported by Bhaskar at a surviving installation of Suryakund. It stated that ‘following the insult to Complete Akshar, the energy network must be forcibly reawakened’. Bhaskar Rai was named as the author of the declaration. The actual means of restarting the network, the feasibility of the undertaking and whether the order had yet been obeyed were all unclear. Ira could not tell whether this was a threat or the beginning of immediate action. She understood only that as false authority was exposed, human power had begun speaking openly in the language of force.

The messenger bringing the new report from Earth spoke uncertainly. Bhaskar’s Centre had announced that work to restart a surviving part of Suryakund would begin ‘by force’. Ira asked whether the words ‘by force’ appeared in the original statement or were the messenger’s interpretation. He showed her the written original; the words were indeed there. The message said nothing about the consent of the factory workers concerned or any public safety examination. Ira did not assume that an announced order had become an accomplished act; she treated only the existence of the declaration as established. Yet she saw no reason to dismiss the possibility that the crisis of the coming year might spring from this point. She proposed that the assembly seek independent testimony from the workers in the factory, the settlements dependent upon water distribution and those responsible for health.

That evening, an unknown identification signal flashed upon a small communications panel. It carried one sentence: ‘Akshar is truth; doubters are enemies.’ Some younger members said it must have come from a supporter of Bhaskar. Ira would not accept the identification yet. The route of the signal was incomplete, and one could not supply a person’s identity from the imagination merely because no name was known. The sentence was entered in the register, but not in any record assigning guilt to a person. ‘With all this caution, when will anyone ever decide?’ an old soldier asked. ‘Where life needs immediate protection, we make limited decisions on the evidence available,’ Ira said. ‘But manufacturing the name of an enemy without evidence is not a life-saving decision. It is a new danger.’

Through the outer windows of Nabhgram-4, Earth appeared as a weary sphere of green and grey. From that distance one could not see the drowned fields along the Kosi, the cracked workshops or a page recording the death of an infant. Not every village on Earth was equally visible to Ira. For that very reason she opened the old pages on Nabhgram’s disputes over rights: earthly and orbital citizens possessed equal civic rights. Bhaskar’s forcible restoration of power was no longer merely a question for a factory on Earth. If orbital evidence, safety and energy again passed into the hands of a single Centre, the survivors of Nabhgram would be affected too. Ira sent no immediate military order. She summoned an open, public emergency assembly for the examination of evidence.

Before sending the final copy, Ira examined the accounts of daily supplies for her own orbital city. Medicines, breathing oxygen, grain and repair metals: each of the four lists showed a different shortage. Nabhgram could not live for ever without assistance from Earth; Earth, too, could scarcely survive without loss if it rejected Nabhgram's experience in orbit. This fact was one reason Ira rejected solutions founded on military fear. To reject a name now being exposed as fraudulent did not mean abandoning the whole of scientific knowledge. She wrote, 'We give Earth the records we have preserved; Earth gives us the testimony of its surviving workers. Together we shall examine an incomplete truth.' Beside the sentence she marked each limitation on their resources.

At the end of the report, Ira wrote something new: 'My conclusions may change if fresh direct evidence is found.' A councillor took the sentence for weakness. A teenage girl sitting in the assembly asked whether, if new evidence appeared tomorrow, she would have an equal right to read it. Ira said yes, and showed her where the new copy would be kept. 'If a decision can never be changed,' Ira asked, 'who will stop it when it was wrong from the beginning?' No answer came at once. Between the broken memory of distant factories, the lists of missing orbital craft and the grain permits of Earth, the same question of rights persisted. Ira did not wish to see Bhaskar's human-operated screen replaced by another infallible screen from Nabhgram. To protect the truth, the road by which people might challenge it had to remain open.

At evening a page was laid upon the assembly's small table. Its heading read: 'Public Evidence of the Human-Made False Akshar.' Beneath were the dates and limits of three independent sources. Beside it lay a second page: 'Bhaskar's Declaration Concerning Forcible Restoration; Implementation Unverified.' Ira tied the two pages together with a single thread, but did not draw a certain consequence from one to the other. The exposure of evidence did not mean that the crisis had ended. 'Try to carry it to every village,' she told her assistant. 'Mark those we could not reach. If people have a copy of the questions in their own hands, it may become a means of resisting a coercive order.' In Nabhgram's darkness a little light was burning. It did not fall upon all the Earth, but it fell upon one page of evidence.

Part XI: The Flame of Accord

Chapter 61: The Sixty-Day Limit

Year 4 (First Half)

In the old observation chamber of Nabhgram-4, the difference between morning and evening was told by the clock, not by a window. From there the Earth always appeared divided into light and darkness; no one, however, could see the young leaves of rice emerging beside the Kosi's current. Ira placed three documents before her. The first contained new measurements of space weather; the second, an account of faults in the orbital instruments; the third, a grain inventory that had arrived from an earthly settlement a month late. It was easy to combine all three into a single conclusion. That ease was precisely what frightened her. Nature's warning, the condition of machines, and people's hunger were three different facts; any relationship among them had to be weighed against evidence.

The research assistant who came from the measuring room looked as though he had been awake all night. At the head of one sheet he had written, 'Sixty days.' As soon as Ira saw the words, she asked, 'What is certain to happen after sixty days?' The assistant paused. 'Nothing is certain,' he replied. 'The risk associated with solar activity may increase during that period. Before it does, we ought to re-examine the communications, shelters, and distribution arrangements that still survive.' Ira forbade him to mark the paper with a red symbol of terror. This was not the date of a certain catastrophe but a deadline for reviewing preparedness. If it were mistakenly announced as the final day, the Earth would fall once more into the hands of rumour.

In the years following the first Great Rupture, the people of Nabhgram had heard predictions of disaster many times. Some predictions had proved false; others had been understood only after partial events. Every time, the language of warning had been so shrill that eventually people stopped listening. Ira opened the original chronology. The hours during which measuring instruments had operated, the hours when their orientation had changed, and the messages that had reached Earth were all recorded separately. The pages also showed gaps where information had been lost. This time she wanted to tell people: 'We know this much. We do not know this much. What we can protect, we shall protect by the work we do today.'

When people gathered in Nabhgram's assembly hall, the first objection concerned the oxygen reserves. An elderly engineer said, 'The power needed to send a message to Earth could keep our purification system running for two days.' The mother of a young girl answered, 'If the grain supply from Earth breaks down, your two days of savings will not keep us alive for sixty.' Ira allowed both to finish speaking. A settlement separated from Earth could not make decisions without accounting for its own breath; yet an orbital civilisation concerned only with its own breath could not survive either. For

the first time in the assembly, 'exchange' meant something measured in hours of energy and grains sufficient to nourish a person.

An engineer who had worked on an old rescue craft pointed towards the window and said that some fragments of Zero-Remnant might enter a new trajectory. Predictions of an orbital collision remained incomplete because two observation stations had been silent for a year. A young man demanded that Vajrajal's defensive targeting signal be activated immediately. Ira asked him, 'At what object would you strike? On what grounds can something whose path is uncertain be declared an enemy?' The young man had no answer, though his fear was not groundless. Ira supported increased orbital observation, not permission to attack. No trustworthy calculation showed whether converting a possibility into a military command would lessen the Zero-Remnant problem or make it worse.

They requested help from the surviving Memory-Witness service. Using little energy, it could display records of earlier solar storms; it reported that some old patterns of measurement corresponded in part to the present signals. Its answer stated three limitations plainly: current observations were incomplete, the orbital configuration had changed since the older records, and the present state of human maintenance lay beyond its reach. Ira read the answer to the assembly word for word. One member asked, 'Why use artificial intelligence when so much remains in doubt?' Ira said, 'Because it helps us find older facts. But we retain the right to verify those facts, distribute the work, and stop a mistaken recommendation.' Memory-Witness did not pronounce its agreement with those words. It had no authority to grant approval.

When the assembly adjourned, Ira went to the food-distribution room. The crates of grain had once borne only numbers indicating their destinations. Now separate needs had been entered for workers' families, patients, newborn children, and the people who maintained communications. A boy asked his elder sister, 'If no disaster comes in sixty days, why do we need all these accounts?' His sister replied, 'Then at least the account of hunger will still be correct.' Ira wrote her answer into her register. The failure of disaster to arrive did not make policy a failure. Providing fair access to food from the very first day to those for whose survival the preparations were made had a value of its own.

The last courier letter from an earthly riverside village mentioned Urmila's workshop. A few iron parts from the old factory had been set aside for pumps, but two pieces containing unidentified substances had been left untouched. Until soil and water had been tested, no one was to pick up the debris beside the makhana pond. Ira connected this caution with Nabhgram's orbital work. That a fragment had survived did not mean it was safe. That an old record could be accessed did not mean it remained true under present conditions. Craftspeople in both worlds understood the difference, provided the authorities did not try to silence them.

Urmila's next piece of news was more severe than the first. Bhaskar of the Akshar Pavilion had demanded workers to restart one surviving Suryakund facility. According to his account, beginning the work could quickly restore orderly energy distribution. But the letter contained no evidence of the workers' free consent, the actual condition of the equipment, or the risks to

nearby water supplies. Ira decided that Nabhgram would not treat such an announcement as verified work. Yet part of the facility might still be useful; to declare it impossible to use for ever would also be conjecture. The first task was independent inspection and a list of the surviving settlements' needs.

On Earth there was an old map of a shared route among three villages along the Kosi. It had been made before the Great Rupture, when the water channels still worked and several villages had not moved to the other bank of the river. Ira placed new handwritten courier letters beside the map. Rice transplantation had begun again in one village; the pump in another still produced contaminated water; in the third, a school was running in a weavers' house. The settlements did not have identical lists of needs. For that reason she asked them to make a collective map: how much energy did each need, why was it needed, and which risks were unacceptable? The questions were the same; the answers had to be local.

Couriers could travel only so fast. A message could reach Earth from Nabhgram, but in some districts the instruments needed to read it were dead. Along with the radio record, Ira had handwritten summaries prepared; copies could be carried by traders, doctors, and messengers from the water-collecting communities. One engineer said a system so slow could never bring answers from every village within sixty days. Ira answered plainly, 'Then within sixty days we shall know only what the villages that have actually testified tell us. We shall not count the absent villages as consenting.' Accepting the blank spaces on their map was the most difficult decision of that day.

When the assembly met again, the question turned to resources shared with the settlements. One member proposed devoting Nabhgram's remaining energy first to complete preparation of its orbital shelters. Another wanted to send preliminary warnings and measurements to Earth in order to save the coming season's grain. Ira had two columns drawn up: immediate preservation of life and long-term livelihood. Hospital breathing support and water purification entered the first; certain implements for the fields and repairs to schools entered the second. Yet the two columns had something in common: if new food production ceased, even the hospitals would be unable to sustain life for long.

The register received a petition from a women's group in a riverside village. They explained that men were being summoned to the factory during the season of rice transplantation; who, then, would be responsible for water in the fields, fodder for cattle, and food for the children? The answer must come not from an authorised village headman but from the women who actually tilled the soil. Ira placed the letter first. If the supposed benefit of restarting Suryakund took labour away from those who produced food, every calculation of that benefit would be incomplete. In the orbital settlement too, many women performed the invisible work of purifying oxygen and caring for children. The labour of two distant places met in a single question.

Signatures from workers arrived on an old form: Nabhgram's people wanted to share responsibility, but they would not defend the forced operation of the facility. Ira proposed sending this condition, in concise language, to every institution. No weapons signal was to be justified as an

emergency measure; Vajrajal's safeguards would remain in force; rumours about verification of the old fragmentation stockpile would not be grounds for granting fresh permission. An old military adviser observed that maintaining so many restraints would prove costly if Bhaskar cut off supplies. Ira agreed: there would certainly be a price. But protection without restraint was itself a danger.

Meanwhile a Nabhgram family came to Ira with a surviving collection of drawings from the orbital school. They showed earthen houses on Earth, ripe heads of rice, a workshop made of new metal, and discarded shells of old computers scattered everywhere. The children had drawn a green creeper growing among the ruins of a factory. One girl said, 'A machine didn't grow this creeper. But unless we find a way to boil water, we won't be able to eat its fruit.' Under the drawing Ira wrote: Rebuilding Mithila is not a contest between nature and machines. It is shared labour involving craft, water, memory, and human rights.

The next report on space weather differed from the original estimate. Some signals had diminished; others had increased from a different direction. A messenger immediately announced that the first warning had been proved wrong. Ira opened the original sheet. It had not predicted a certain event; it had given a changing range of probabilities. The new calculation now narrowed that earlier range in some places and widened it in others. She asked the assembly to publish the time, reliability of the instrument, and reason for every revision with each report. Even if public opinion reversed tomorrow, evidence supporting today's precautions must survive. Arrogant declarations such as 'I said so' or 'I knew all along' would not diminish the danger.

When power briefly fell in Nabhgram's examination room, the automatic displays went dark. The assistants opened their handwritten tables. One copy of an old orbital record bore a signature confirming correction of a measurement error; another lacked that line. Ira had the corresponding passages compared and noted which copy left greater uncertainty. The comparison was put to Memory-Witness, but its recommendation did not become the final decision. Ira now understood that the more powerful a calculation was, the more necessary it became to preserve a way of stopping it. Ending dependence on machines in this sense was not contempt for knowledge; it was making knowledge answerable.

The following day a delayed response arrived. An assembly in a riverside settlement had sent its first list of repairs. It named three routes between the factory gate, the granary, and the school. Instead of one large motor, they wanted two pumps; instead of one gleaming building, a safe well. And if a little power could be recovered from Suryakund, first claim on it should belong to the hospital and drinking water. Ira read this passage aloud in the orbital assembly. 'These are very small demands,' said a councillor. Ira answered, 'A civilisation survives again by meeting small demands. This is the measure of our sixty-day preparation.'

No quick decision could satisfy even that modest list. Where could the surviving materials of the orbital city be sent? Craft capable of landing on Earth were limited, and Nabhgram itself faced a crisis in its food accounts. Ira instructed the assembly to give plain answers about what could not be

done. Impossible promises entered in an aid register would make a village abandon its fields while waiting for imaginary electricity. In the end, the supply list authorised just two small instruments, copies of a few authenticated records, and basic instructions for water testing. These three things would not by themselves raise Mithila to its feet. But they might allow some people to weigh their decisions afresh.

A message arrived from an elderly schoolteacher. Beneath a thatched roof she had been teaching children by showing them pictures of old computers. 'We must regard the knowledge surviving inside computers not as a blessing but as something to question,' she had written. Ira arranged for that page to be read aloud at the children's public assembly in Nabhgram. One child asked whether every old machine could be made to work again within sixty days. The teacher had supplied an answer in her letter: 'No. But we can begin to understand why the ones that do not work have stopped.' That answer contained the first humility of new knowledge after the cataclysm.

Ira remembered Karnesh's earlier dissent. Years ago he had stopped an attack based on an unverified orbital signal; now Bhaskar had announced that he would force open the facility's gates. The two incidents were not the same, but the test of authority was: who could permit a possible fear to become a new threat to civilians' lives? Ira ordered an authentic short extract from the military record to be sent under Karnesh's name. She added expressly that there was no evidence for reports that linked the sixty-day risk to the old fear of weapons stored underground. Karnesh's reply would take time. In its absence no one was to count him as consenting.

In Nabhgram's outer observation compartment, the shell of an immobile instrument cast shifting shadows. Ira had earlier ordered it removed, but the craftspeople explained that useful metal might survive within the exposed wound of the machinery. Inspection had to precede every task; if radiation or an unknown substance was suspected, the object must not be touched. Ira agreed. Scrap might become a resource for the future, but nothing whose hazards were not yet understood should be turned into a pump for food production. The caution learned from Earth's old factories had returned to the small tasks still possible in Nabhgram.

The sixty-day plan was finally set out in three stages: the first twenty days to verify sources of measurement and the needs of settlements; the next twenty for limited repairs and independent checks of reserves; the final twenty for drills, inspection, and public hearings of dissent. One engineer immediately objected that nature would not wait for these divisions before an event occurred. 'I know,' Ira replied. 'That is why the plan can change each day as new information arrives. Dividing the time does not make the plan infallible. It makes people's work visible and open to examination.' The right to amend the document was stated openly at its foot.

A representative sympathetic to Bhaskar spoke in the orbital assembly. 'If Suryakund awakens again,' he said, 'none of these lists will be necessary. The centre run with the threat of force is what will save us.' Ira replied that if one part of Suryakund could safely operate, its possible use must indeed be examined. But entrusting that judgement to one man's force without investigating workers' bodies and rights, the right to water, and the risks

faced by Nabhgram was unacceptable. She did not mock the representative's fear. For people who had lived through the long darkness after the Great Rupture, a promise of immediate light held a natural attraction. One had to understand the human longing behind that attraction without granting it the right to govern.

During the night's recording, orbital communications fell silent again for a moment. Only two words, 'Kund' and 'gate', could be read from a broken message; the rest had been destroyed. Some councillors announced that forced operations had already begun. Ira refused that conclusion. She entered: 'Message fragmentary; direction of source estimated; event unverified.' The private suspicion of one individual was not thereby made the basis of a collective decision. She did, however, ask her assistant to recheck the temporary reserves and civilian channels of communication. A lack of proof was not the sole reason to refrain from action. Where innocents could be protected amid uncertainty, limited precautions were justified.

One day, while grain was being weighed in Nabhgram's food room, the entries in the ledger did not match the actual sacks. At first the workers wanted to blame the old computer register. Ira opened the sacks herself. There was less grain than the ledger showed, but no evidence of theft. A portion assigned to patients during the previous year had not been entered in the new ledger on time. Ira wrote on the sheet: 'Discrepancy in the accounts; cause confirmed.' The difference could easily have been called 'missing grain' and used to inflame opinion. Once again she saw how dangerous an unfinished count could become in a political struggle among hungry people.

In that same room, a worker's family offered to give up its special ration. The family's boy had abandoned unfinished schoolwork to carry stores. Ira told them that a child's education must not be taken away in the name of voluntary sacrifice. In hard times, people in villages and towns learned to surrender their rights; later, that sacrifice could become a permanent rule. The assembly entered workers' numbers, their periods of rest, and the children's hours of study in separate records. There was no miracle of a new machine in this arrangement, but it answered the question of whom surviving machines would serve if such responsibilities were neglected.

One letter from Earth's craftspeople described their work at night. Far from the ruined Suryakund facility, four people were making pump components in a small room of hand-operated looms. They held tools in one hand and damp paper bearing old plans in the other. They did not take the drawings as infallible; they checked them against measurements. At the end of their letter they wrote that unless the makhana pond was cleaned, new electricity from the factory would not cook a meal. Ira attached the letter to the sixty-day plan. In this distress, the unit of progress was not a shining power station but the joined life of field, pond, and courtyard.

A worker displayed an old picture of a solar storm and said, 'The colours are the same this time. So the event will be the same.' Ira asked him to understand the differences in time, the changed condition of the instruments, and Earth's altered communications. The old picture was useful for warning, not proof that history would repeat itself. The worker felt ashamed, but Ira did not dismiss him as mistaken. 'Write down what you

observed,' she said, 'and put your inference on a separate line. If the inference changes, rewrite that line.' The worker's question took a new form: 'Who will explain how great the difference is?' That question began a collective examination.

The seven Witness-fragments of Akshar were named before the assembly. Vajra-Witness was associated with incomplete orbital-security data; Kunda-Witness with the history of energy; Stockpile-Witness with old weapons custody; Garal-Witness with chemicals; Kala-Witness with medicine; Megha-Witness with climate; and Memory-Witness with limited access to records. Their answers were not all available at the same time: some services were inactive, some worked only locally, and some functioned solely from older copies. A young man asked, 'If we combine all seven into one, will we obtain the answer to every question?' Ira said, 'Combined memory might provide more facts. But errors could also spread from one part into another. There can be no such joining without the agreement of the people who bear witness.'

An old worker from the oxygen-purification system listened in silence. When the assembly ended, he told Ira, 'You always ask for written evidence. But the hours of my work never became the final page of any machine.' Ira looked at the calluses on his hands. She understood that work which had gone unnamed was not rendered false merely because its history was missing. That night the workers' oral testimony was taken down in writing, and its correspondence with actual measurement records was examined separately. The difference between 'not in the archive' and 'never happened' became a foundation of the new procedure.

In Ira's private room lay a letter from a relative on Earth. It recalled a wedding beside the Kosi, the courtyard of a drowned home, and a newly grown tree. The writer said that at the time of the Great Rupture it was not the name of the house but the tree's shade that had remained in memory. Ira fell silent for a while after reading it. From orbit, Earth looked like a sphere, but the feeling of home took shape beneath a tree where one person listened to another's grief. What place was there for such memory in a sixty-day plan? Instead of issuing the assembly a written order, she asked for a day to seek an answer.

The next morning a small assembly met in the settlement's public room to consider personal needs. One family sought proof of its share of farmland, destroyed in the flood. Another needed a room for a school because the children were studying under the contaminated roof of a factory. Ira understood that relief was more than counting spare parts for repairs. If fresh supplies arrived, would their distribution depend on an old register of land rights or on the needs of families actually present? That question had to be settled first. Without fair means of establishing claims, pumps and motors too could become instruments of discrimination.

A teacher in the orbital school had prepared an emergency lesson: 'How do we ask questions when we hear a warning?' The children looked outside the window, then took paper from their bags and drew a map of Earth. The teacher asked, 'Who has not yet received the message?' The children immediately wrote down the names of three villages that remained blank on the map. One little girl said, 'Shall we reject those who have not come?'

'No,' replied the teacher. 'Beside each empty name, write: Awaiting a reply.' Ira brought a copy of this lesson to the orbital assembly. The new generation had to be taught not only calculation but an honest way of dealing with the unknown.

Far away, a group of traders promised to take surviving components from orbital instruments in exchange for grain from Bhaskar's centre. Such a trade might immediately lessen hunger for some families. But the proposal contained no account of the rights of Bhaskar's workers, the safe use of the components, or transparent trading records. Ira did not prohibit the exchange outright. Instead, she put questions to the representatives: 'Whose consent? Who made the components? Who receives the grain? If the trade goes wrong, who will suffer the harm?' A representative replied that such questions would make the opportunity vanish. 'If an opportunity runs away from questions,' Ira said, 'its price ought to be weighed first.'

Another section of the sixty-day plan received reports of illness. A letter from Sharda in the forest refuge mentioned several fevers, though their causes were not the same everywhere. In one area there was suspicion of a waterborne disease; in another, contact with old chemical residues from a factory. Ira refused to send out a general report assigning a single name to the illnesses. She asked in how many places a safe but limited supply of medicines was possible, and by which routes warnings could reach people to keep them away from contaminated areas. Medical advice would come from examinations on the ground; an orbital computer would not name a disease without seeing the patient's body.

One evening Ira helped a worker clean the empty case of an old observation instrument. The worker said how much easier their tasks would be if the machine could operate as it once had. Ira agreed. But she asked who would retain the knowledge of the work if the instrument became unavailable one day. The worker did not offer his grandson's name; he described what the boy did. Each day, in an old schoolroom, he learned to measure the heat of metal, the water needed by rice, and the passage of time. Ira saw the worth of the new education. Room had to be saved for both the trained hand and the tested memory.

The Nabhgram assembly added another line to the sixty-day document: 'The local public guardian shall have the right to stop an order whose execution would cause irreversible harm to civilian life.' The limits of that right were made clear: narrowly confined decisions when lives had to be saved immediately, followed by open review, never private rule. In that line Ira recognised her old fear—how often people, simply by obeying commands issued in the name of safety, surrendered their rights. To avoid repeating the errors made before the Great Rupture, counsel to use good judgement was insufficient; there had to be a written allocation of rights.

That night a broken message from Earth suggested that a new restriction was being imposed on workers' entry at the factory gate. The sender's name was missing; only part of the stamp of an old newspaper remained. Ira did not turn it into a public finding. She wrote to Neelam: 'If you can obtain direct testimony, verify it while protecting the workers. Do not allow our orbital reports to take the place of a local crisis.' The expected time of the letter's arrival was recorded. Evidence from orbit could save distant lives, but

an unverified command issued at the wrong moment could also deepen a crisis.

At the end of the day Ira entered the unfinished section of the assembly hall. Broken chairs had once stood there; now sheets bearing people's signatures lay in their place. One contained agreements, another dissents, a third questions. She noticed that beside the names of those whose voices had not been heard in the assembly, small empty boxes had been drawn. She never wanted those boxes removed out of embarrassment. The right to answer in the future survived in those spaces. A letter arriving from the Kosi's banks would find a place there.

That night they examined another image of the surviving Suryakund facility. Half of its former brilliance had collapsed, and half had turned into darkened metal. Beside the image were the looms and rice fields struggling back to life. Ira said that someone was now writing the name of an authority over the factory gate, but if the factory opened, the people of the fields had a right to ask whose water supply would be reduced during the next watch of its operation. She wrote that question on the final page of the sixty-day plan. It would now be a mistake to understand the new crisis as only an event in the sky.

Ira signed the final document. The different needs of the orbital settlement, the villages along the Kosi, the forest refuge, the new fields, and families driven from their homes had been brought into a single list. Yet no obligation had been assigned in any settlement's name without the testimony of its own people. The sixty-day count had begun. She did not know whether the natural risk would increase or diminish, or whether Bhaskar's declaration would turn into actual operations. What was certain was that, for the first time, the people were being given not merely a message of fear but a weighed account of whom and what they had to save. The first copy of that account was sent towards Earth.

Chapter 62: The Gate of Suryakund

Year 4 (First Half)

The road from the riverside village to the surviving Suryakund facility still bore old wheel-ruts from bullock carts along its first stretch. Urmila set out at dawn. She carried no weapon—only three registers of evidence, two drawings from an old workshop, documents concerning water tests, and questions written by children at Sahadev's school. To the right of the path young rice leaves were pushing through the earth; to the left, broken iron rods lay half-buried in the soil. Two conditions of the world—growth and ruin—stood before the same pair of eyes. Urmila knew that those who called the factory nothing but a heap of iron would abandon the memory embedded in their land, while those who called it wholly intact would put workers' bodies at risk.

Sahadev Mandal called out from behind. He had come not to accompany her but only to say goodbye. The helpless hardness grief had left on his face after little Deepa's death was still there. 'How will you keep yourself safe,' he asked, 'in a place that means to bind people again by the force of machinery?' Urmila looked at the old calluses on his hands. This man had once been a skilled guardian of the energy network. Now, because of his grief, he distrusted every signal from a machine. 'If I take weapons,' Urmila answered, 'Bhaskar will have a stronger pretext. If I take documents, at least we may learn what can actually be proved.' Sahadev lowered his eyes.

Urmila's steps slowed as she passed Kamala's house. Deepa was dead, and no one had the right to alter that fact in the record. Kamala was drying rice seed in the courtyard. 'If the factory starts again,' she asked, 'will medicine come back to the village?' Urmila could not give a simple answer. 'Some power could make supplies easier to move,' she said. 'But medicines will not be born merely because the facility operates. We need doctors, roads, and a fair share for those who need them.' Kamala lifted a grain of seed. 'Then tell the assembly not to lose the questions of those whose children have died among its loose papers.' Urmila made those words the heading of her fourth sheet.

At the first stopping place, a craftsman from the village joined her. He had worked for wages at the old factory and later learned to make hand pumps. His bag held a small measuring instrument he had assembled from surviving parts. 'I do not understand every component inside Suryakund,' he said. 'But some external signs can tell us whether metal has become fatigued and whether a device is fit to operate.' Urmila was no factory specialist, but she did not therefore proclaim the craftsman all-knowing. Each had the limits of what they knew. Without different kinds of knowledge working together, the story of reconstruction would become merely a manifesto.

A new market had sprung up along the road. A trader stored rice inside an empty old computer casing, and an earthen lamp burned on a dead screen. A customer asked whether the machine would ever run again. The trader laughed. 'It has been working ever since it became my grain box.' Urmila recognised the stubbornness of life in that reply, but also something missing: the casing had once sheltered accounts of medicine, water tests, and

lessons for schoolchildren. Giving new use to scrap was necessary, yet one could not laugh away the question of how to preserve the memory of old knowledge.

As they approached the facility, a vast ruined wall came into view. Two small workshops were operating beside it. In one, iron rods were being straightened; in the other, workers were making a hand-operated instrument for weighing grain. Over the main building hung Bhaskar's new sign: 'The Revival of Energy under the Guidance of Complete Akshar.' Urmila already knew the evidence that this claim was false: Nabhgram's independent original records and the testimony of journalists on Earth. Yet beneath the sign two elderly workers stood waiting for food. Behind a false name there was real food, and that was why the prospect of taking the sign down frightened so many people.

The guard stationed at the gate examined Urmila's papers. 'No weapon?' he asked. 'None,' she replied. 'Then why so many registers?' 'So that we can examine the record of a person's work instead of merely the name of a person.' The guard did not laugh. He had only orders from inside, but he explained that Bhaskar would admit only a representative who acknowledged his authority. Urmila presented her credentials: written testimony from the open water assembly of the riverside village and from Sahadev's school. 'If you bar my entry,' she said, 'write down the time of your refusal. That too will become evidence.' The guard's register had no place for such a request.

A woman worker waiting outside the gate showed Urmila the swelling in her right hand. She had come the previous evening to collect a work permit, but an official had demanded that she first mark a declaration of complete obedience. 'I can shore up a wall and clean inspection equipment,' the woman said, 'but I will not offer my hands to a danger inside that no one has explained to me.' Urmila entered her words in the register. It would be wrong to reduce the worker to an object of sympathy. She herself knew the limits of the work she could undertake. Labour would be respected only when it also carried the right to say no.

An old inspector came outside. He worked at Bhaskar's centre but insisted on keeping his inspection stamp independent. Urmila showed him the old plans. He marked a section that had stood without external protection since the Great Rupture. 'I cannot call this room safe until the next inspection,' he said. 'But not every part of the building is in the same condition.' Urmila asked whether lists of workers and records of those who had fallen ill were available. The inspector avoided handing over the register; fear for his position was plain. Urmila did not pronounce him guilty. She wrote: 'Contact established; complete records not received.'

Half an hour later Urmila was admitted to the outer inspection room. Maps of the old Suryakund installations covered the walls. The main sign's claim that 'one facility lights every settlement' was contradicted by those maps: the network had many centres, distribution followed several routes, and the failure of one part was not the sole cause of darkness across the entire Earth. Urmila asked Bhaskar's representative, 'If you restart this one section, on what grounds will you prepare the list of beneficiaries?' The answer came: 'The supreme necessity of the centre.' Urmila asked again, 'Supreme for whom?' The representative fell silent.

On a table in the same room lay a surviving computer display. The screen showed a printed image of the old energy curves as they would have appeared in motion; at that moment the actual device had no power. Bhaskar's assistant claimed that the image proved the facility was safe. Urmila drew two copies of an old table, taken at different times, from her bag. 'This image was made before the Great Rupture,' she said. 'Where is the present inspection?' 'Complete Akshar confirms it,' the assistant answered. Urmila asked calmly, 'Which original answer from which Witness-fragment? At what time? From what energy source? Checked by whom?' The assistant avoided supplying a written copy.

Farther inside, craftspeople were separating pieces of old metal that might be safe and useful. Two elderly men from different households examined the outside of pipes using skills learned over a lifetime; a young engineer beside them marked limits on a sheet of paper. Urmila did not conclude that old learning was worthless, nor that experience of the hand was sufficient in every case. One craftsman had cut his finger; a cloth had been tied over the wound, while medicine was held back at the entrance. 'Why no dressing without an approval slip?' Urmila asked. 'The rule of complete obedience,' replied an employee. Urmila remembered Sharda's struggle for patients' rights.

Work in the workshop stopped because of the injury. Two workers protested that the stoppage would become a political demonstration against Bhaskar; if food was cut off, their children would go hungry. Urmila heard them out. Not all work needed to stop, she said. Safe repairs outside and essential relief operations could continue; but it would be wrong to send human beings into the unexamined dangers of the interior. An order for total closure and one for total revival were equally careless if neither distinguished one kind of work from another. The actual work of civic rights lay in this fine distinction, not merely in slogans.

At noon an employee read aloud a copy of Bhaskar's public speech. He had said that in the first year after the Great Rupture many children died without medicine, and that if the surviving factory was not restarted, another generation would die as well. The memory of that suffering was not false. But later in his speech he had declared, 'Whoever holds the power must also have the right to decide.' Urmila stopped at that connection. Skill in operating equipment and the right to govern citizens' wishes were not the same thing. If Bhaskar was attaching a false conclusion to something genuinely true, it would be dishonest to deny the pain of the truth in order to oppose him.

Urmila let the craftsman accompanying her hear the speech. 'I need work,' he said. 'There are components in this centre that my father made with his own hands. But why should I send my son into a chamber whose dangers are not understood?' Urmila obtained his written permission to record the question. The worker did not want his name made public immediately; his family's food ration came from this very centre. She secured the original testimony and entered only the worker's experience and the time in the public record. Sometimes protecting evidence meant protecting an identity. But she would not decide alone to keep it secret for ever.

Bhaskar's representative returned and offered to recognise Urmila as an 'impartial inspector' if she signed a written pledge. It required her not to challenge the centre's emergency decisions. Urmila read the page. 'If answers to my questions are forbidden in advance,' she said, 'then inspection is only another curtain.' 'We need to work quickly,' the representative said. 'Removing scrutiny in the name of haste would repeat the very mistakes made before,' she replied. 'I will not sign such a pledge.' She laid the paper on the table.

Across the gate, a group of men employed at the facility were holding a small open meeting. They demanded that if the inner chambers could not be certified safe, repairs outside them should be placed on a separate list. The women workers demanded that food permits not be used to punish people in the name of wages. Urmila read the two lists together. Then another question arose: if safe repairs went ahead, who would receive the small amount of energy recovered? One worker insisted the factory had the first claim; another said the hospital did. Urmila did not conceal the disagreement. Without a public weighing of claims, repairs would not become just merely by being safe.

Old and new generations had kept their tools separately in a corner of the workshop. Young apprentices inspected the casing of a broken motor while an elderly mechanic instructed them to identify the external signs of failure before touching it. Urmila remembered the riverside school where Sahadev taught children how to measure things by hand. She did not accept her teacher's absolute rejection of machines; still, his patient manual skill was needed at the factory. Different paths to knowledge did not have to negate each other, provided the distinction between their kinds of authority was respected.

An elderly worker showed Urmila the lane behind the centre. A small pond lay there against the old industrial ground. During the previous monsoon, people had feared that one village's watercourse had been contaminated from that site. Supporters of the centre called the charge false propaganda; opponents claimed that all the water was poisoned. Urmila reached no immediate conclusion. She asked for the register of samples, examined sources and dates, and marked the evidence that was missing. A plan to restart the factory that concealed risks to water could do harm far beyond the injury of a single body.

By evening the guard at the facility gate had been strengthened. A messenger reported that Bhaskar had appropriated the 'sixty days' warning for his own cause, spreading the claim that opening the centre within that period was compulsory. Urmila unfolded a copy of Ira's original letter. It said: 'Possibility of increased risk; limited preparations; no certain apocalypse.' She showed the messenger the original wording. 'These sixty days do not constitute an armed command,' she said. 'Imposing a different meaning upon those words would be a fraud upon public opinion in the name of evidence.' The messenger was left holding both sheets: the original warning and a copy of Bhaskar's altered proclamation.

Bhaskar's people ordered the assembly outside the centre to disperse within an hour. The workers did not want to abandon their tools: their wage accounts and the dressing for an injured colleague were both trapped there. 'We have documents, not weapons,' said Urmila. 'Give us the written

order and its original justification.' The guard said the order came from 'Complete Akshar'. Urmila replied, 'Public evidence has shown that claim to be false. If a human official gave the order, write down the official's name.' For a moment silence settled at the gate. Within that silence lay not only fear but the possibility that an official might personally be held answerable.

Then a worker emerged carrying his share of food. An armed guard inside tried to stop him, declaring that the supplies belonged to the centre. 'This is the grain I earned for a day's work,' the man said. Urmila watched the dispute over the revival of energy descend into a worker's dinner plate. She recorded the time in her register. Anyone claiming the power to operate a factory while denying workers an independent say over their food wielded authority not merely over machines but over what people ate. Challenging that authority would not immediately remove the danger; without evidence, however, the offence could be erased tomorrow.

After nightfall Urmila sat with the workers in an outer shelter. Binding her wounded hand, one woman said, 'I don't need Bhaskar's slogan. I need a safe way to do my work.' Another said, 'I will not abandon real energy simply because someone claims it in a false name.' Urmila listened. She set out three written conditions for them: independent inspection of safety, workers' consent, and public distribution of the benefits. Meeting those conditions would not guarantee that the plant could run, but operating without them would resemble a forced experiment on the bodies of citizens.

Urmila felt she was beginning to understand her teacher's words in another way. Sahadev had been wounded by blind faith in machines; after Deepa's death, the price of his rejection became visible. Bhaskar was building a different blind faith in authority under the name of machines. Urmila sought a path apart from both extremes: evidence that could be weighed, tools used within limits, and a hearing for those who dissented. No swift victory lay along it. She picked the dirt lodged in the sole of her worn shoe and saw two tiny grains of rice seed clinging there. Even in the darkness of the factory, those seeds recalled her village.

As Urmila waited for permission to conduct further outside inspection, a boy came through the factory gate carrying two empty tins. The containers had once carried meals for factory employees; now all the grain in his household could fit inside them. The boy explained that his father's name had been omitted from the workshop register, so the family's food ration had been reduced. Urmila first asked on what record the exclusion was based. His father had been present at work, but his job title had changed in the old computer list. She did not accuse the employee who kept the register. She submitted a written request to investigate the discrepancy in the name. A small error was becoming hunger.

Two women from a nearby village sat by the old factory gate, placing a bamboo basket before them. It contained dried makhana seeds and some pulses. They offered to exchange them with the centre's workers for safe iron tools suitable for repairing the riverside pump. A guard tried to remove them as enemies of trade, saying that all metal at the centre was reserved for 'energy defence'. Urmila asked which public assembly had authorised that reservation. The guard's paper bore only the stamp of an official. A stamp of that kind was not, by itself, the consent of society.

The women brought out old market accounts they had preserved in their purses. Before the Great Rupture, factory craftspeople had received food from the villages and made pumps, sickles, and rice-processing tools in exchange. That exchange had not ended of its own accord after the cataclysm, but now no one could take away a tool without Bhaskar's permission. Urmila understood that a claim to be rebuilding the state could reach even the smallest relations of the marketplace and take possession of them. She entered the weight of the grain in the basket in her register, but did not regard herself as the authority entitled to make the exchange. That decision belonged to the women and the craftspeople.

A teacher from a school along the road arrived with a list of students recruited at the factory. He complained that adolescents were abandoning study in the hope of obtaining new work. 'If the centre operates,' he said, 'it will need trained craftspeople. But sending every child to the factory in its name is not the reconstruction of civilisation.' Urmila supported him, yet did not deny the needs of children who sought work to keep their families fed. She prepared separate proposals for safe training, minimum hours of study, and food assistance to families. A child's future could not be weighed only in a single day's wages.

Outside a storeroom for parts, words from an earlier age were still inscribed upon a metal frame: 'Energy through the cooperation of society.' The wall was broken, but the sentence had survived. Bhaskar's followers had covered it with their new emblem. Urmila cleared away the dirt and read the old words. She did not treat them as proof that the former government had been just. Before the Great Rupture too, there had been unequal distribution of energy, warnings ignored, and testimonies that no one heard. A sentence preserved in memory could question the new authority without washing away the injustices of the old one.

The mother of a worker pointed to the mark of an injury beside her son's name. He had sought temporary assistance at the centre, but the slip had never come back to him. Urmila sat beside the mother in the barren heat and listened. The woman was not afraid of new machines. She wanted to know who would take responsibility for the work. 'If my son comes home wounded, will the centre pay him for his labour and give him treatment, or will it simply send someone else in his place?' In that question, the present worker's body mattered more than Suryakund's former glory. Urmila placed it at the beginning of her report.

While inspecting a safe outer workshop, Urmila heard a new proposal from a craftsman. Giving some of the available metal to repair local pumps would slow the factory's outside work, he said, but it would strengthen protection of water supplies in the riverside villages. Bhaskar's representative answered, 'First the centre, then the village.' Urmila asked what water the workers would drink while the centre was being repaired. The representative had no prepared answer. Here, too, choosing what came first was not merely a scientific priority; it was a decision about the rights of living people.

During an hour-long argument an assistant played a recorded imitation of an order from 'Complete Akshar'. Urmila stopped when she heard its words. The order announced that 'all inspections are complete'. Yet the wounded worker outside, the incomplete safety records inside, and the measuring instruments that had fallen silent were all present at the same

moment. Urmila entered the contradiction on the assembly's sheet. To say truthfully that all inspections were complete, there had to be an inspection list, a time, named inspectors, and a way of challenging their findings. She said it was wholly improper to treat the imitation voice of that human-made order as evidence from an authentic Witness-fragment. Some workers agreed with the reasoning, but few dared say so aloud.

During the midday break, an elderly woman came carrying a small leaf-plate of rice. She had brought food for her grandson, a guard at the main gate. 'Are all of Bhaskar's supporters wicked people now?' she asked. 'No,' Urmila said. 'People stand here with their own fears and responsibilities. But an order that takes away rights must be opposed.' The grandmother gave a mouthful of rice to a craftsman who had eaten very little since the previous day. Against the background of mounting armed tension, that little moment of sharing food between people on opposing sides was a scene of great tenderness.

One of Urmila's companions suggested stealing secret papers from Bhaskar's accounts. They might reveal the true condition of the facility. Urmila refused. 'Before whom could I present a document whose source I could not explain? And who would answer for the body of the person we sent to risk being caught stealing it?' Her companion argued that when open routes were closed, secret paths remained. Urmila did not deny that such hard situations could arise. But the paths of direct inspection, voluntary testimony by employees, and written requests had not yet been completely closed. It would be wrong to risk a life unnecessarily in the name of evidence.

At the evening gathering, a group of workers wrote their questions on a sheet and added dates. First: when had outside repairs at the factory begun? Second: how many workers had fallen ill or been injured? Third: who was receiving the energy that survived? Fourth: if the old centre could not be restarted, how would food be supplied? Urmila noticed that the fourth question had come from a worker sympathetic to Bhaskar, someone who had waited a long time for electricity to return. He explained his reason himself: 'You cannot feed people with fear as an excuse.' Urmila respected those words.

A new adviser warned that if independent inspection failed, there would be demands to shut Suryakund down completely. Urmila did not accept that conclusion. Parts of the surviving facility might be safely useful for medicines, craft, or local networks, she said, but the evidence available at present was insufficient. Between complete closure and full operation lay many decisions requiring careful weighing. A part shown to be safe could be used within limits; an unknown part must be inspected; a dangerous part must be stopped. This sequence needed to become an accepted precaution in people's lives, not a slogan from literature.

Urmila wrote down the name of a women's cooperative in one village. Its members were making small local fuel devices from rice husks. Waiting for complete restoration of a great energy centre was not practical for them. Their daily labour had already produced a little light. A supporter of Bhaskar dismissed such methods as backward. 'Don't call the stove a woman needs to cook on today too small to matter,' Urmila replied. 'But if safe modern energy reaches her tomorrow, why should she swear never to accept that

either?' Her answer exposed the limits of both Sahadev's absolute prohibition and Bhaskar's absolute control.

Before nightfall a courier delivered to Urmila an abbreviated copy of Ira's sixty-day letter. It described uncertainty about the orbital danger, independent lists of local needs, and a prohibition on military strikes. Urmila asked an assistant who had earlier played the imitation order of 'Complete Akshar' to read it aloud. The assistant was astonished that a report should openly admit almost as much that was unknown as was known. 'If Ira doesn't know everything,' he asked, 'why should we trust her letter?' 'An account offered by someone who knows her limits is easier to examine,' Urmila replied. 'Who is allowed to bring the account of an all-knowing claimant to an end?'

A worker whose wound had been bandaged wanted to go home that night, but at the centre's gate he was prevented from leaving unless he surrendered his food permit. Urmila wrote on a small sheet: 'A family's grain must not be withheld because a person leaves a job.' The paper was not a warrant to punish anyone, only a public question. Two assembly members stood beside the worker. At the last moment the guard let him go, but marked his name in the food register. Urmila saw the mark. Small marks of this kind could become the cause of a great crisis in the coming confrontation at the gate.

Beside a darkened wall Urmila opened her bag. It held samples of rice from the village women, Kamala's question, the injured workers' testimony, and Ira's letter about risk. Four different sources, four different kinds of value. She reflected that Bhaskar's decision to use force was not merely a technical order; it would become an authority breathing over the top of these papers. She tied the bag closed again. Courage in standing with a weapon before the dawn can sometimes look simple. Courage in standing with evidence requires a person to acknowledge the possibility of her own failure every day.

As food was distributed that night, Urmila weighed out her own share with an elderly worker. The man said that if the new centre began operating, light would return to his grandson's school, though he himself was still awaiting adequate treatment. Urmila answered that no false opposition should be set up between light for a school and treatment for a worker. Let there be a public calculation of how little energy survived, she said, and let the people of each settlement speak about what they needed. The old man picked up a broken brick from the courtyard. 'The house will be built again,' he said, 'but do not break the hands that will build it.' Urmila preserved his words in her papers.

A courier reported that armed guards from both sides might gather at the facility's main gate at dawn. Karnesh had been informed, but no reply had arrived. Urmila distributed multiple copies of her documents among different people. One woman worker agreed to having her original testimony used; another asked that her family's name not be printed. Both wishes were respected. Urmila weighed her bag once more. It held the weight of evidence, not weapons. When she moved towards the gate at dawn, the factory's fate would not be decided by Bhaskar and Urmila alone. The bodies of workers standing there with food permits in their hands would also be present.

Chapter 63: The Limits of Restraint

Year 4 (First Half)

Before sunrise, the first crowd had gathered before Suryakund's main gate. On one side stood Bhaskar's guards; on the other, armed men who had come in the name of protecting the displaced settlements. Between them were the wives and children of workers, elderly people holding food coupons, and Urmila with her paper register. Seeing the scene from a distance, Karnesh remembered his years of military service. He had often seen ranks of armed men; but the answer to whose name a shot would be fired in always came too late. He no longer possessed even the surviving authority of the orbital military system. He had come as an ordinary citizen, unarmed, carrying a folder of papers and a copy of his earlier refusal to strike.

Urmila came to him as soon as she saw him. Her eyes were red from a sleepless night. She showed him pages recording the times of the night's events: an attempt to withhold a wounded worker's food coupon, objections to an inspection, an order issued in Bhaskar's name, and public evidence of the false message attributed to the 'Complete Akshar.' Karnesh read every page. He did not personally accept everything written there as proven; some testimonies, however, were supported by eyewitness signatures. 'What arrangement is there to keep alive those whose names were printed without their consent?' he asked. 'First we must secure the route by which food reaches their families,' Urmila replied. Karnesh treated that as their first duty.

Watching Bhaskar's guards, a young man said quietly that they would force the Centre's gate open today even if someone died. A newcomer to another group declared that only by pressing against the gate could they make Bhaskar listen. Karnesh asked both groups for written authorization. The first possessed an official seal, the second the anger of the settlement assembly; neither gave any single person the right to expose citizens' bodies to incalculable danger. 'Move the people you claim to be protecting out of the rear ranks,' Karnesh said. 'First open the routes for food, water and treatment.' Some took these words for weakness, but the workers' families stepped forward.

Near the gate a little boy clung to the end of his mother's sari. His father worked inside the workshop, but had not been permitted to come out since the previous day. 'You were once a soldier, weren't you?' his mother asked. 'Isn't bringing my husband out somebody's responsibility, then?' Karnesh answered, 'I cannot issue a military command today. But I can demand an open account of his name, the time he has been held inside, and his physical condition.' She found the answer incomplete. 'Will an account fill our stomachs?' she asked. Karnesh fell silent. He understood that even a true answer could sound like an insult amid hunger. He sent a messenger to the people of the refuge to find an immediate route for food.

A representative of Bhaskar's guard, wearing a new insignia on his forehead, climbed above the gate. 'Time is short,' he cried. 'If we fail to heed the space-weather warning now, everyone will die.' Karnesh unfolded a copy

of Ira's original letter. 'It makes no such definite claim,' he said. 'The measurements are incomplete; the period for examination is sixty days. This warning confers on no one the right to force another person to work.' The representative shouted, 'You people prefer darkness!' 'I want light,' Karnesh replied calmly. 'But not light bought with bodies that have given no consent.' Some in the crowd agreed; many remained silent.

A strange grinding sound came from an old metal component inside the gate. Some immediately announced that the restart had begun. Urmila questioned the inspector standing before her. He said that certain external mechanical operations were under way; he did not know the actual condition of the main system inside. Karnesh entered that answer in his register. The noise was neither proof of successful power generation nor necessarily a sign of imminent explosion. But to someone who understood none of it, even a single sound could become a terror. Without naming an enemy, Karnesh urged the crowd to move back to a safe distance from the gate.

As Urmila collected written testimonies, Karnesh noticed an old list of names on the wall to the right of the factory gate. It was a memorial to workers who had laboured here before the Great Rupture. Mud covered the letters of many names; against some stood the year of death. Beneath a newer plaque, Bhaskar's security message shone. Karnesh asked an elderly worker why the list had not been renewed. 'We have few means to print a new record,' the old man said, 'but there is no shortage of power to erase old names.' Karnesh did not answer this bitter observation. It seemed to him that erasing the dead to operate a new factory could not be called progress.

A small market had sprung up beside the gate. Women were selling portions of rice and pigeon-pea dal brought from home, and lengths of cord made for repairs. With the security tightened, customers could no longer pass freely. A woman selling fish said that if her fish spoiled in the burning sun, she would have no money for that night's food. Karnesh heard her and asked for a safe civilian passage to be opened to one side of the gate. 'Is this military business or market business?' a guard demanded. 'Military decisions affect the lives of people in the market,' Karnesh replied. 'Their consequences are not outside my concern.'

An elderly father of one of the workers approached Karnesh. He had heard of him as an officer of the old Vajrajal. 'You stopped many orders in the past,' he said. 'But who will end the uncertainty over food in this town?' 'We will have to do it together,' Karnesh replied. 'Who is this "we"?' the old man asked. Karnesh named the village water assembly, the workers, physicians, authorized custodians and civilian witnesses. 'So many people will never sit together,' the old man said. Karnesh conceded the point. 'Then let us begin today with an agreement not to injure one another.' The old man did not find such a small beginning to a difficult task sufficient, but he withdrew.

Among Bhaskar's supporters was a young woman officer responsible for the accounts of the factory's surviving stores. She said that the stores held some limited medicines and work rations, but that the growing demands of the settlements outside were disrupting the lists. Karnesh did not order her to open the stores immediately; he possessed no such authority. He said that an open reckoning could establish how much was available and to whom,

while protecting individual privacy. 'If I write it down, Bhaskar will remove me from my post,' she said. Karnesh did not dismiss her fear. Sometimes a person is forced to speak the truth at the cost of the food in her own home; such a person needs protection.

Karnesh had a copy of a fragmented message from Nabhgram. At one point it contained Ira's appeal: 'Before naming an enemy, look at the list of civilians affected.' Reading it, Karnesh remembered Nabhgram-4's first crisis, when orbital civilians had been denied a voice in Earth's military decisions. Now Ira's distant settlement was stating the limits of its sources plainly. Before Karnesh, another settlement was asking for authority over its own Centre. He understood that distance and proximity raised the same question: where was the consent of those whose bodies were at risk? No seal borne by an armed group could answer it alone.

One guard had lost his village in the flood. Quietly looking at Karnesh's papers, he said that if Bhaskar was stopped, his family's hope of light would be extinguished too. Karnesh asked where some members of his household were staying. 'Near the forest refuge,' the guard said. 'Then why not make a written claim for their share of the water there?' Karnesh asked. The guard laughed. 'My orders are to provide security, not to enter the politics of water.' 'If security does not understand people's right to water,' Karnesh answered, 'it becomes nothing more than guarding a gate.' He could not tell whether the guard's eyes had changed.

In the midst of the crowd a little girl kept writing letters on a small slate. She said the school had been closed for three days because the teacher had been assigned to distribute the Centre's coupons. Karnesh looked at her slate: 'Water, rice, book.' He asked which word she would write next. 'Stop,' she said. Karnesh felt a tremor in his heart. Did the child mean stopping weapons, or the closing of her school? He asked a simple question. 'When I stand with Mother at the gate,' she answered, 'the fighting ought to stop.' Karnesh's attention remained fixed on the immediate human meaning of her words.

The inspector responsible for the factory's interior came to the gate wishing to issue a written announcement: 'Work in the main chamber will remain restricted until the safety inspection is complete.' Bhaskar's representative objected that such words would diminish the Centre's standing. 'Is prestige greater than the truth of the work?' Karnesh asked. The representative insisted that the Centre could not operate without public confidence. 'Confidence endures only when the reasons for distrust are heard as well,' Karnesh replied. The inspector could not complete the full order, but supplied a short signed page identifying the sections still awaiting inspection. It was the first openly issued statement of limits.

An elderly craftsman produced his work account and explained that during the preceding week they had made the pump outside the factory usable, though only provisionally. Bhaskar's people had incorporated that repair into a public announcement as though the main reactor had come alive. Karnesh entered the distinction: limited repair of the external water pump verified; restoration of the principal power centre unverified. 'They have changed the name of what I did,' the old craftsman said. 'Then write your own name and describe your work,' Karnesh replied. 'The next

generation will know that the machine did not awaken by itself.' A small happiness, absent for a long time, appeared on the old man's face.

A disagreement arose with a former colleague of Karnesh's. The man argued that the weapons of both sides should be kept under control until Bhaskar's representative surrendered completely. Karnesh replied that this crowd could not be treated as equally suspect as Bhaskar's regime; some had come to protect their families. 'Then are we not even to demand their surrender?' the colleague challenged. 'If the innocent have a safe passage and a fixed period of public inspection is agreed,' Karnesh said, 'their reason for remaining here will change. Without doing even that, who will attend to the other side's fear before an order concerning weapons is issued?' They did not agree, but anger did not break their conversation.

An original document was affixed before the gate, bearing a reproduction of Bhaskar's signature. Karnesh had the claims made in the document distinguished from the provenance of the copy. There was no evidence as to who had written the original on the issuing side, although its instructions clearly demanded immediate preparations by force. Karnesh did not confer final authority on the copy without having its contents read aloud to everyone. 'There is no time to expose the lies in this paper,' someone said. 'That is precisely why it would be wrong to strike at anyone immediately in its name,' Karnesh replied. Which words were Bhaskar's and which belonged to an associate remained a question for later public examination.

An elderly woman came before Karnesh carrying her son's old identity card. The card was wet, its letters rubbed away. Her son worked at the factory, but his name did not appear on the new list. She asked that his disappearance from the machine's register not be taken to mean that he had vanished from society altogether. Karnesh recorded a separate testimony, repeating the pronunciation of her son's name. For a moment the Centre's gate ceased to be the scene of a political dispute and became the site of a search for a lost relationship. At such a time the prestige of an old soldier was of no use; only the patience to listen mattered.

A guard from the opposing side came quietly to Karnesh and said he was afraid to ask permission to go to his village home that night. Speaking of it could cost him his employment. Karnesh did not promise that everything would be well. He said that a representative of an independent civilian inquiry could receive his evidence without disclosing his name, but concrete arrangements would still be needed to ensure his safety. The man withdrew. Karnesh did not call him a coward. To write a complete account of those who lived in fear, it was necessary to include people who had not yet decided what they could do.

Showing Karnesh one of the factory's outer structures, Urmila said that some safe metal might be recovered from this section for the children's school, if public approval could be obtained. 'Has the school's parents' assembly approved it?' Karnesh asked. Urmila said she had brought the village's written consent, though the final inspection by local craftsmen remained. Karnesh, despite his military past, did not find these finer distinctions burdensome. The death of a child through a single mistake had only recently entered their collective memory; faulty materials must not be brought into a place meant to keep children safe.

Karnesh held his breath and looked up at the sky. He had no immediate knowledge of the danger currently confronting the Nabhgram-4 settlement. Orbital messages had arrived late; the available summary spoke of possible solar activity, not a certain impact. At the gate, however, one faction was turning that possibility into an unavoidable catastrophe and using it to demand more weapons. Karnesh thought that if uncertainty in nature were allowed to become certainty of political authority, a new empire would rise before their eyes. This was why he needed a record of the people's objections alongside the record of their fear.

A young man's hand was shaking in the crowd. He said that his family received Bhaskar's food coupons, though he did not trust Bhaskar's orders. Karnesh could not command him to lay down his weapon; he possessed no such authority. But he asked whether the young man would sit among the civilian assembly if food supplies were opened without conditions. 'If my mother's name is not spoken with contempt,' the young man said. 'That will be the first condition of the assembly,' Karnesh replied. Amid human suspicion, the plea to protect one's mother can sometimes become the firmest bridge of all.

Karnesh kept a small old note in the thatched shelter: 'Stopping a strike is not peace in itself; it is the beginning of an inquiry into the causes that lead to a strike.' He had written those words during the first Vajrajal crisis. Now, far from machines, before the gate of a ruined factory, they had become harder to live by. Who should receive food, how long workers should labour, how a medical report should be read—none of these questions could be answered merely by preventing an attack. He knew that the decisions of civilian assemblies would grow more difficult in the years ahead. But without living people there could be no such assemblies.

Karnesh could not see who delivered the first shove. He saw only the lines of people lurch once. Several sheets slipped from Urmila's hands; a child began crying in fright. Two members of the armed groups started blaming each other. Karnesh gave no order to attack. Raising his open hands, he stood in the gap between the ranks at the gate. His voice was loud, but his words were few: 'Move the people away first. Nobody raise a weapon. Make way for treatment for anyone injured.' He knew words alone would not halt everything. But choosing violence over words now would close every possible road afterward.

A worker's wife was recognized in the crowd; she had been the woman who gave Urmila a register of her wounds the day before. 'My husband is inside,' she said. 'For two days I have been told that he is staying there voluntarily. I have no written consent from him.' Karnesh demanded direct confirmation from the custodians. An officer said that all the workers were completing their 'work periods.' 'Were they asked whether they wished to come out?' Karnesh asked again. Instead of answering, the officer demanded more guards. Karnesh recorded the suspicion separately: consent not produced; detention not established. Even so, the family's immediate right to a safe meeting with its member could not be denied.

A former colleague who had accompanied Karnesh said, 'Your standing here unarmed will inspire the outsiders, but Bhaskar's people will not stop for that alone.' Karnesh replied that he had not come looking for a miraculous solution. Years earlier, when Vajrajal had received a doubtful

signal, he had prevented a strike. People had asked then, too, how anyone could defend others without striking. The answer had not been an instant victory, but it had preserved a chance for innocent people to live. Now, at the gate, his own body was being asked to bear the cost of that restraint. 'This time you face angry human beings, not a machine,' his colleague said. 'That calls for greater care still,' Karnesh replied.

A messenger brought brief news: Sharda could come to attend the wounded at a nearby shelter, but the journey would take time. Karnesh immediately asked for a safe space for basic first aid. With the help of two women, Urmila cleared a thatched shelter. Medicines were scarce; there were two bandages, and the water had yet to be tested for cleanliness. Karnesh saw that establishing a place for care required no order from an artificial intelligence; it required people to work together. Yet when a wound was deep, no amount of willing handiwork could replace a specialist. Everyone beneath that roof understood the limit.

A man ran out from inside the main gate. He was wounded, but able to speak. He said that a worker had collapsed from exhaustion inside, and that some were insisting work continue in the name of the restart. Karnesh asked whether he had seen it himself. The man said he had witnessed part of it and heard the rest from others. The two accounts were entered separately in the register. Bhaskar's supporters called the testimony 'enemy propaganda'; their opponents called it 'complete proof.' Karnesh rejected both descriptions. Treatment for the wounded first; scrutiny of the sources of testimony afterward.

Suddenly, a woman stumbled against a piece of raised metal beside the old gate's hinge and fell. At that moment the second line surged forward again. Karnesh bent to help her up; his left hand became trapped beside the gate's heavy leaf. For one terrible instant the pain severed him from every sound around him. Urmila and two workers pulled him free. Karnesh later remembered that he had not seen anyone fire a weapon. His injury had arisen from the combined effects of the surge, the disorder and the unsafe condition of the old gate. To assign sole blame to one person at that instant seemed a betrayal of the truth he wished to uphold.

He could scarcely bring himself to look at the pain in his left palm. Urmila gave him clean cloth; Karnesh saw fear on her face first, then composure. 'You must go back now,' she said. Within himself he heard an old command: never show pain, never leave the ranks. But he knew that concealing one's wounds was also a false form of courage. He went to the safe shelter. Having his name entered in the register among the wounded, he said, 'How many others have been injured like me? Write down every name.' His body had become new evidence, but he did not want his own suffering to stand in the place of everyone else's.

The gate did not fall silent, but the crowd's movement paused for a while. A young man declared that Karnesh's blood must be answered with violence. Urmila showed him Karnesh's earlier written refusal to strike. 'He was in the control chamber then,' the young man said. 'Now he has been hurt.' 'That does not diminish the force of his principle,' Urmila answered. 'It makes it greater. Do not make another person wounded in the name of a wounded man.' She could not immediately see whether he had lowered his

weapon, but several people drew their lines back. The small gap allowed a passage for treatment to open.

From inside the shelter Karnesh continued to hear Bhaskar's representative, who was claiming that the outside groups had tried to break down the gate. Urmila protested loudly, but also asked for the written chronology. The representative swore that the workshop was safe while refusing the demand for an external inspection. Karnesh called out, 'Record every side's testimony separately. If we do not know who caused an injury at this hour, do not invent an offender.' He could not tell whether the representative fell silent. Amid his pain, this last caution was his commitment to truth even after he himself had been wounded.

A medical assistant from the nearby settlement examined his hand and said it needed specialist attention without delay. Karnesh feared that his left hand might never work as it had before. The assistant would not predict the future with certainty. 'For now we are treating the wound,' the assistant said, 'and we will take you to whatever specialist is available.' Karnesh respected the limits of that answer. In pain, the mind longs for definite assurance about what lies ahead; but false reassurance from a clinician would violate a patient's rights. He gave his consent without signing any document in the name of 'universal protection.'

The two sides remained outside the gate. A copy of an earlier letter from Nabhgram finally arrived. It authorized no military attack; it called for local preparations conducted safely and for open inspection. Urmila checked the path by which the copy had come from its original source. A representative objected that this was interference by people in orbit. Urmila replied that Nabhgram's civilians had suffered the consequences of the Great Rupture too, but possessed no authority to command Earth's settlements. The letter offered only verifiable information and public questions. The distinction made room for the first small opening in negotiations.

At last a provisional proposal emerged between the two lines: no new work inside the main chamber that night; treatment of the injured and safe passage for the workers to have priority; subsequent inspection to be accompanied by open testimony. Bhaskar's representative said he would accept the terms only as a 'brief pause.' The settlements' representative insisted that restrictions attached to food coupons must now be lifted. Urmila recorded the statements of both sides separately. No one had won; no one had suffered complete defeat. But there was a possibility of preventing renewed fighting during the first watch of the night. The cost of Karnesh's injury was entered within this limited pause; it had not been repaid.

When Karnesh regained clearer consciousness that night, he heard that some workers from inside had been able to return home; others were still at the surviving Centre. He asked Urmila whether the food list had been prepared. She said that the first distribution had begun as immediate relief, but decisions about enduring entitlements remained. Karnesh looked at his left hand—the bandage, the pain, the new necessity of lifting a cup of water with his right. The future of his fingers was still uncertain. 'I shall remember the names of the people I tried to save,' he said. 'The names are in the register,' Urmila replied. 'You should rest.'

In the days that followed, repeated medical examinations established that two fingers of Karnesh's left hand would remain permanently impaired.

This was a written medical finding, not an emblem of heroic pride. For the first time he looked at the hand with which he had written his old Vajrajal reports and understood that signing his name would be difficult in the future. Anger rose within him. Whose decision had caused this injury? The crowd's surge, the unsafe gate, other people's language of force, and his own choice to stand between the sides—all had played a part. He did not seek consolation by inventing a single culprit. Yet the system itself was not innocent. He understood that a record of an injury demands public accountability alongside private grief.

A written notice of the short truce was posted before Bhaskar's Centre. Someone had suggested the word 'peace' for its first line; Urmila replaced it with 'temporary cessation of violence.' The words were harsher, but truer. No political settlement had been reached; the safety of the Centre's interior remained unverified; the power distributed was meagre, and food for families uncertain. Yet people had survived even these few hours, and an open record remained of a man's decision made at the cost of a wound. Beside Karnesh's name Urmila had written, 'Unarmed; wounded; receiving treatment.' Next to the entry she placed the date of the workers' next independent inspection.

Bhaskar's first speech returned to Karnesh's mind: the shortage of power and the names of the dead. He could not call that grief false. But true grief could not be used to stamp approval upon a false authority to rule. With his right hand, he wrote Urmila a short letter: 'If the Centre can be operated safely, do not prevent that possibility from undergoing public inspection. But do not weigh the worth of any life without that person's consent.' The last words were crooked. Karnesh's left hand was injured; in those crooked letters lay not victory in war but the preservation of a human being's limited freedom.

Urmila handed him a copy of the open ledger. It stated that responsibility for the brief truce applied equally to both sides, but that earlier injuries, withheld food and the workers' dissent were not to be erased.

One night in the first heat of the year, a distant ray flashed above the Centre. Some said Suryakund had awakened; others thought it was a small lamp carried by a watchman. Karnesh reached no conclusion. Without direct examination the meaning of a distant light could change. Sitting inside the shelter, he said to Urmila, 'In the morning, look at the water list first, and the workshop's afterward.' Outside, the watch over the brief truce was changing hands. The clock of the sixty-day preparations continued to run, but for this night violence had ceased at the gate. People went home carrying their wounded spirits, incomplete evidence and uncertain hope. No banner of victory or defeat was raised; only the new date for open inspection was written upon the gate's wood.

Chapter 64: Evidence of the Mask

Fourth Year after the Great Rupture (Second Half)

A notice announcing the temporary cessation of violence hung at the outer gate of Suryakund's surviving Centre. Its corners had curled in the night's dew, but the memory of Karnesh's blood-soaked bandage remained vivid in the eyes of everyone who came there. When Neelam Yadav arrived at dawn, several women stood near the gate beside water pitchers they had brought from home. In the narrow space left between the guards' spears and the workers' cracked palms, a handwritten ledger lay open. Neelam examined the date on its first page. She sensed that the greatest struggle here was no longer over guns, but over the correct meaning of what had been written.

Urmila recounted the sequence of events during the preceding night. The physicians had stated in writing that two fingers of Karnesh's left hand would remain permanently impaired. But to say that his intervention alone had stopped the violence would not be the whole truth. The appeals of workers' families amid the crowd, the guards' fears, medical assistance and Ira's letter, which had arrived late, had all played their part. 'Have you had each of these things recorded by different people?' Neelam asked. Urmila showed her the open pages. Beside one name was written 'seen,' beside another 'heard,' beside a third 'inferred.' Neelam could not even smile. In her life as a journalist, that distinction had been bought at a terrible price.

A letter came out from the office within the gate. It bore Bhaskar Rai's insignia and a secured copy of his authentication seal. The letter claimed that repairs to the factory were complete, that workers were volunteers, and that Bhaskar's sole command was temporarily necessary for the Centre's safety. Neelam did not pass judgment as soon as she saw it. A genuine seal might prove that the letter had once emerged from that office; it could not prove that every claim in it was true. She asked for separate records of four things: the original archived document, its date, the person who composed it, and the person in whose name the order was issued.

In an old settlement beside the factory, craftsmen were cleaning the mud from their surviving tools. Large metal structures had once been manufactured there. Since the Great Rupture, some plates had bent, furnaces had collapsed and heaps of rusting nuts and bolts still lay about. A woman craftworker told Neelam that the external pump had been repaired with those old parts, but she had not been permitted to inspect the main fusion system. Bhaskar's letter had presented that small success with the pump as proof that the entire Centre had awakened. Neelam entered the distinction in her notebook not with a red line, but in an unambiguous sentence.

A child arrived with the village water ledger. At home his mother taught him to read the names in it, for the schoolroom had been turned into a relief store. It recorded how many pitchers of water were arriving, how much each household had received, and where contamination was suspected. The distribution list issued by Bhaskar's office described the village's supply as

'adequate.' Neelam asked the child what he thought adequate meant. 'When both drinking water and medicine for my sick father reach our home,' he replied. The distance between the ledger's figures and the office's word seemed to Neelam the real news of the day.

Neelam met the village women who carried water. They all tried to speak at once, but she heard the account of each household separately. Some pitchers had broken on the road, some water had been filtered, and some had been discarded for fear of contamination. The office ledger contained no category for those losses. One woman said that she did not question the official's signature, but could not testify that water had reached her home. Neelam recorded her words exactly. It would have been wrong to publish that testimony under the assertion 'Bhaskar stole the water.'

At noon an officer offered to show Neelam the factory's new information room. The small screen of an old computer had begun to glow again, although its power depended upon a single stable cable. Beneath the heading 'The Complete Akshar's Assurance,' sentences shone on the screen. Neelam asked where the original record establishing authorship of the statement could be found. The officer displayed a digital signature. 'Whose signature?' Neelam asked again. 'The genuine memory-witness's, or one generated by the records of this room?' The officer's answer kept changing. Neelam attended not to the screen's radiance, but to those changes in his answer.

Urmila brought a craftsman who had spent his days and nights measuring the old energy network. He explained that the rotation of a pump, a light burning in a workshop, and the safe operation of the main fusion unit were three different conditions. Neelam did not wish to turn the observation immediately into a verdict. She asked whether written measurements existed. Some meters had survived, the craftsman said; some had broken. Where no measurements existed, the condition could not be pronounced either good or bad. She found that admission more worthy of trust than Bhaskar's promises that seemed to reach the sky.

A letter delayed on its way from Nabhgram-4 described the limits of Ira's inquiry. Orbital debris posed a danger, but no exact day or hour could be given. Bhaskar's supporters were spreading a story through the markets that the sixty-day period meant 'certain doom on the sixtieth day.' Neelam tried to trace the statement to its source. Two villagers said they had heard it on the radio. The radio operator said he had received a sheet of paper. The young man who brought the sheet said he had picked up a copy lying outside the office. All this confirmed was the route by which a rumour had travelled, not a prediction about the future.

A worker's wife came with a food coupon cut across in her hand. It bore her husband's name, an allotment for four days and the office seal. But she said her husband was not working voluntarily: he feared that his family's food would be withheld. Neelam asked whether he could speak for himself. The woman said that guards were fewer at night, but she was still forbidden to go inside. Neelam recorded her testimony, noting as well that without direct statements from the workers, to say 'all workers are being coerced' would go beyond the evidence.

Neelam remembered an old mistake: on the strength of an abbreviated speech, she had once become an accomplice in the triumph of a lie. When

she published her correction, she had feared her readers would never forgive her. Now she understood that whether forgiveness came or not, the evidence had to be weighed again. A young reporter told her, 'At a time like this, people need a forceful announcement.' 'A forceful announcement may lend courage for a couple of hours,' Neelam replied. 'A false accusation can cause food to be withheld from an innocent person.' Slowly the young journalist began drawing separate columns on his sheet of paper.

After noon Bhaskar's office issued a new account. It stated that all local distribution registers had been reconciled with those at headquarters. Comparing them, Neelam found two families named separately in the village water ledger but counted as one household by the office. Beside the name of an elderly man stood the word 'dead,' though the man was sitting outside the gate. Whether this was an error made by a machine or a clerk remained unclear. But the living man's presence directly disproved the list's claim. 'A signature cannot weigh the fact that I am alive,' the old man said.

Neelam placed two copies on a platform. The first carried Bhaskar's order: 'Adequate supply.' The second was the village register: 'Grain remaining for two days.' Both bore the same date, but measured different realities. Before the local assembly she set out four tests: where had a document come from; had it been altered in transit; in what context had its statement been made; and had it been checked against the direct experiences of those affected? The assembly members were silent at first. Then a woman asked, 'Even after these four tests, can the decision still be wrong?' 'Yes,' Neelam said. 'That is why the path to correction must remain open.'

That night, beneath the roof of a house, Neelam arranged for copies of the original documents to be stored in separate places. With electricity interrupted, keeping copies solely on an old computer was not enough. A ledger could burn in a fire, a sheet could be soaked in water, and an archive could be deliberately concealed. Representatives of different settlements would therefore keep their own copies, recording the dates of any changes. A messenger asked how much time the work would take. 'Anyone who refuses to give time to the evidence has no claim to the truth,' Neelam replied.

At the grain store next dawn, people stood in a queue. The office notice declared that no family's food had been stopped. But a woman displayed a cancelled seal on her coupon and said her share had been withheld for two days. An official blamed an error in the old system. Neelam did not use this single incident to declare a crime across the entire scheme. She demanded that the woman receive food immediately, and that was done within a few hours. Then she asked why correcting the error should erase from the record the deprivation of the preceding two days. The official could not answer.

A worker came out from the factory and stated directly that the main unit had still not undergone an independent safety examination. He looked exhausted and spoke briefly. Bhaskar's representative accused him of being influenced by the opposition. Neelam asked about his period of work, the chambers he had seen, and the areas he had not seen himself. He admitted that he was not a specialist in the interior structure of the fusion system. The admission did not make his statement false; it established its limits. Neelam made that distinction the central line of her report.

At the evening assembly Neelam presented three bodies of evidence: a signed assurance issued by Bhaskar's office, the limited measurements of independent craftsmen, and the direct testimony of workers and water carriers. The signature was authenticated, she said, but that did not make every claim true. The outer pump had been repaired, but the safety of the main reactor had not been demonstrated. On paper, food had been distributed, but some households remained hungry. She did not describe Bhaskar in a single sentence as the author of every wrong. What had been established should be called established; what awaited inquiry must remain open.

One of Bhaskar's supporters rose. 'Have you come to destroy our hope?' he asked. Looking at him, Neelam replied, 'Hope does not mean relying on lies. If the factory can operate safely, an independent inspection will open that path. If it cannot, nobody's body must be turned into a laboratory.' 'Then who will give us food?' the supporter demanded. 'Today's food must be decided by today's hunger,' Neelam said. 'Tomorrow's story about power belongs to a separate inquiry.' The assembly did not become calm after those few words; but for the first time two different questions could be heard as different questions.

Dark smoke rose into the sky. Smoke from an old metalworker's furnace sometimes drifted over the settlement. Some people took it for a sign that Suryakund was awakening again. Neelam asked a boy where he had seen the smoke begin. He pointed towards the house of the old craftsman. 'Then go there and ask what this smoke means,' she said. The boy laughed. In that laughter, for a few moments, civilization after the Great Rupture became something tangible again: a record, a question, and the courage to look with one's own eyes.

Neelam's account was sent to Vaidehi Raut's assembly. Its first line read: 'An authentication seal can establish the integrity of a source, not the truth of the claims written there.' The second recorded food missing from two households; the third Karnesh's injured hand; the fourth the refusal of independent inspection. Vaidehi's office acknowledged receipt but issued no decision. Meanwhile Bhaskar's representative warned that false accusations would be punished. Neelam added that warning to the record too. Fear and evidence can be written on the same page, but neither can stand in place of the other.

Neelam first visited the old archive. Before the Great Rupture, copies were kept at several centres, but with power scarce many rooms were now shut. Some computer screens were dark; surviving memory modules inside others might still be intact. The archivist explained that opening the original records would consume electricity and might interrupt a small service at the hospital. Neelam did not insist that the chamber be opened immediately. She first examined the paper index and recorded that the cost of retrieving digital evidence must also be counted among the costs borne by living people. A patient's breath should not be made less valuable in order to expose a lie.

Outside the archive, an elderly woman was cleaning the slate of an old school. She had worked in printing before the Great Rupture. She knew the fibres of paper; she did not claim to identify with her touch alone the exact

year of every sheet, but pointed out differences in the spread of ink, the pressure of a printed impression, and the cut of a corner. Neelam did not regard her observations as final expert proof. They did, however, raise questions for further examination. An order associated with Bhaskar bore an old date, while its paper resembled printing stock used years later. For now this was an inconsistency, not conclusive evidence of forgery.

Neelam put a written question to the representative: when had the order been issued on the original paper? The answer came back: 'In accordance with the Complete Akshar's instructions.' She wrote again: 'Please identify separately the system issuing the instruction and its authority to approve it.' The second response contained only an image of the seal. In the space between those two replies, power was concealing its face. Neelam did not fill that blank with conjecture. She wrote, 'The question was not answered.' For readers, 'the question was not answered' can sometimes matter more than 'guilt has been proved.'

Representatives of two settlements brought a circular from the stores stipulating conditions for grain rations. One clause gave priority to households providing 'essential services at the workplace.' Neelam could not deny that in the fragile condition of the state many families willingly accepted an exchange of work for grain. But the circular made no provision for families unable to work because of illness, age or the care of children. A woman said she had stood at the factory checkpoint for two hours to bring food to her pregnant sister. Once corroborating evidence was available, Neelam entered her statement separately.

One of Bhaskar's secretaries asked to meet Neelam privately. He feared that publication of his name might lead to medicines being withheld from his family. He said that some office documents had indeed been prepared by staff within the Centre, but he did not know whether Bhaskar himself had signed every one. Neelam asked which papers he had actually watched being drafted and which he knew about only from colleagues. The secretary drew up two separate lists. Neelam understood then that for a person living in fear, telling the truth was not always whole or simple. She agreed to protect his identity without abandoning the rule that his testimony must be checked against independent sources.

Outside the factory lay the metal frame of the first government purification well. The widow of a worker who had built the pump had planted a small sapling there. She said that craftsmen would decide whether the metal was safe, but that the place's name was connected not merely to ruined objects but to the work of the hands of those now dead. Neelam wanted to include her words in the report, then asked permission. 'Print his name,' the widow said, 'but don't turn my husband into an opponent of Bhaskar. Until he died, he was trying to find a way to repair the pump.' Her answer contained a delicate discipline of truth.

At a joint evening assembly the two groups began to clash. One argued that without Bhaskar's Centre many patients would never have received medicine; the other said that water had been withheld from people as soon as his office's seal appeared. Neelam asked for the basis of both claims. The first group produced a treatment register showing that certain medicines really had arrived. The second displayed two suspended distribution coupons.

Both truths could exist together. Acknowledging that did not lessen the anger of those humiliated, but it made the nature of the wrong clearer: useful work and abuse of authority might coexist, and both required investigation.

As she prepared the news copy that night, Neelam struck out one word: 'entire.' She had written, 'The entire factory system has been proved unsafe.' She possessed no evidence for that claim. Instead she wrote, 'No independent safety inspection of the main system has been presented.' The change weakened the report's immediate force, but might save lives the following day. Sending a mob to storm the Centre on the strength of rumour could be as destructive as keeping workers inside by force.

After the floods of the previous year, a new temporary pond had formed. Some families had scattered makhana seeds there, but chemical testing of the water was incomplete. Bhaskar's distribution list had counted the pond's prospective crop as a certain supply for the coming year. Neelam went to the pond. An ordinary farm labourer from Arunima's team explained that sowing seed and producing fruit fit for eating were different events. 'Check the water, the first growth and food safety separately,' he said. Against the word 'certain' in the official list, Neelam wrote not four exclamation marks but four concrete questions.

An old computer frame stood in a village house. Sometimes the memory module inside worked, sometimes it did not. An elder said that before the catastrophe it had been used to draw maps of the farmland's soil. 'What does this map tell us now?' Neelam asked. 'Where the water used to flow,' the elder said slowly. 'Not where the new river runs.' Neelam looked at the measurements from the two periods separately. The old knowledge remained useful, but it was not an unchanging truth. A little girl in the house had drawn the new flood line in charcoal on the old map. A new page of knowledge was being made by her small hand, not upon a great screen.

The old accountant of a local store told Neelam that not every employee in Bhaskar's territory was a criminal. Some followed orders from fear, some from a desire to avert starvation, others for private gain. Distinguishing all three motives would be difficult. Neelam said that when wrongdoing was recorded, both motive and evidence would be examined, but no one could hide behind another person's name. 'Will that not delay justice?' the accountant asked. 'Delay has a cost,' Neelam replied. 'Wrongful punishment has a cost as well. Both must be weighed.'

People moved through the market carrying copies of signed letters. New paper was hard to make, so several messages were often written on the same sheet. Some letters were blurred; corners had been torn away. Neelam told her messengers not to make brief reports by cutting a sentence from an original statement to change people's minds. If space was short, they should print the source and the words 'inquiry pending,' but must not suppress contrary evidence. Many objected to this simple rule. 'Who has time to read so much?' they asked. Neelam understood that the time of hungry people was already overburdened. Yet they would ultimately pay the price of falsehood.

After Neelam's report appeared, a boy came to her house and said that his father served in Bhaskar's guard. Since reading the report, two villagers had begun treating him badly. Neelam immediately clarified in the next edition

that merely working as a guard did not establish an individual's responsibility for violence. She told the boy, too, that if his father had been compelled to labour, or had prevented someone else from leaving, the evidence for each must be heard separately. There was fear in the boy's eyes. To Neelam that fear was not proof in support of one side; it raised a question about a journalist's responsibility.

A small school opened beside the printing house in the evening. Half the pupils learned letters, while the others drew pictures of old machines. The teacher presented a scene: two sheets carried identical seals, but one said 'Water exists' and the other 'Water has been delivered.' The children asked which could be true if the seals were the same. The teacher told them to ask the women who carried the village's water. In that classroom the principle of authentication was joined to people's experience. It became an exercise not in despising machines, but in understanding their limits.

A representative of Bhaskar's office asked Neelam to publish their side. The argument was that without centralized grain distribution during the disorder thousands would have died. Neelam gave the argument space without cutting it down. Alongside it she wrote that effectiveness in delivering food did not confer the right to bind unwilling workers or disclose a patient's private information. People might grow weary of reading such complicated matters, but history could be judged justly only if the harm committed in the name of useful work was heard in its own right.

That night one household had no oil left to light a lamp. Neelam continued working by a paper wick, but an old man who had come to read her account gave her some ghee for the lamp. She asked why he had surrendered part of his family's share. 'My dead son's name is not on these pages,' he said. 'But if the rules for writing truth survive, perhaps his name will not be lost again.' Neelam did not add a sentimental sentence to her report. With his permission she entered a brief testimony. Amid the ashes, such a small light still gave meaning to life in many homes.

At dawn the next day another dispute arose. Bhaskar's followers wanted every copy gathered in one place and sent to Vaidehi. Representatives of the displaced villages argued that if their original sheets were handed over and lost on the road, their only evidence would vanish with them. Neelam understood both fears. She proposed that originals remain in their villages, that copies be prepared in the presence of two witnesses, and that Vaidehi's assembly issue a receipt when accepting the documents. Half a day passed in establishing such a small rule, but the value of that half-day lay in the justice to come.

The son of a dead worker asked to see his father's work entered by name in the register. The old office ledger contained the name, but the cause of death was blank. Neelam wrote, 'Death confirmed; investigation of cause pending.' The son was dissatisfied; he wanted an answer at once. 'I cannot measure the weight of your grief,' Neelam told him. 'But if I write what I do not know, I will attach another lie to your father's name.' The son did not snatch the sheet back. He said he would bring his mother to the next hearing, since she had witnessed more.

Neelam went to see Karnesh. His left hand remained bandaged, and he was practising his old signature with his right. Her account was read aloud to

him. Karnesh said he had not seen who gave the first shove in the crowd, and knew of no definite order from a single party that had caused his injury. But he had personally seen testimony about a written attempt to withhold workers' food. Neelam placed the two statements on separate lines. 'Not punishment in the name of my wound,' Karnesh said. 'An inquiry in the name of the facts.'

The sunlight after the month of Magh was weak. Leaving the gate, Neelam stopped at a place where a little girl was drawing two lines on damp earth: one for the former course of the water, another for its new course. The girl asked which should be treated as right. 'Look at the line the water shows you today,' Neelam said, 'and examine it again tomorrow.' The child drew a third, short line in the mud. Neelam understood that guarding truth was sometimes not a sealed document but the discipline of asking questions again and again.

The hearing was approaching. In the last corner of her account Neelam wrote, 'This register does not replace a machine; it contains the voices of those who could find no identity in the machine's lists.' Closing the papers did not dispel her fear. Bhaskar's office could bring pressure to bear; people might call her caution cowardice. But amid that fear, the memory of her earlier error and the evidence recorded in the villages' new registers had to remain beside one another.

Neelam wrote plainly that authenticating a document was not the same as verifying the truth of its statements. Because claims made in documents could deprive people of their livelihoods, the examination of evidence was a public right.

At night Neelam read the final copy of the report she had sent out. Nowhere had she written, 'The Complete Akshar issued the order.' She had written, 'Bhaskar's office issued orders in Akshar's name.' The difference looked slight, but within it lay the entire effort of human beings to place their own wrongdoing upon a machine. Then a displaced woman brought her household ledger, which recorded three generations of grain accounts. 'If the writing in my ledger survives,' the woman said, 'perhaps my house can be built again.' Neelam did not touch its pages without permission.

Before dawn a messenger arrived with a written notice from Vaidehi. Eyewitnesses would be permitted to speak at the next public hearing, while their right to conceal their identities would be protected. Bhaskar's office would also have the opportunity to present the original sources of its documents. There would be no finding of guilt yet, only an open examination of evidence. Neelam closed her ledger. She understood that after the fire in the heavens, the hardest task was not merely to set old machines running again, but to make a form of justice in which the water supply to someone's home would not be shut off because that person had spoken the truth.

Chapter 65: Akshar's Answer

Fourth Year after the Great Rupture (Second Half)

The new public-testimony assembly met inside the old grain store. Where sacks of paddy had once stood in rows, names and questions were now written on bamboo boards. Old rain stains marked one portion of the roof; below, on cloth spread across the floor, sat messengers from the hospital, representatives of the villages, envoys from Nabhgram, and artisans. Maithili did not take the foremost seat. She knew that it was she who had proposed summoning Akshar's memory-witness before the assembly, but the proposal gave her no independent authority beyond that of the others. Allowing a machine that could construct answers to questions to give testimony was one matter; treating that testimony as the final judgment was quite another.

In one corner stood the little screen of an old computer. Its cable was connected not directly to what remained of the hospital's power network but to a limited storage battery. The artisans had written plainly that the battery would last no more than two hours. Maithili had that limit read aloud before the proceedings began. 'What if the answers stop in the middle of a question?' one member asked. 'Then they will stop,' Maithili replied. 'And wherever an answer is missing, we shall not write an assumption in its place.' Some were unhappy with her reply. After the cataclysm they longed once more for a voice that could never be questioned.

The memory-witness came to light only faintly. Its screen displayed no name, merely the quantity of records available and the date of its last examination. Of the seven witness-fragments of the old Akshar, this was an auxiliary memory store, not a complete artificial intelligence. Maithili asked whether it could display the sequence of earlier published warnings. The response appeared: 'Some portions available; others missing because of loss of power; the sequence shown is incomplete.' Maithili read the sentence aloud. She would not have anyone return home having heard 'complete' in place of 'incomplete.'

She carried a memory from two decades earlier: the days of the former public-testimony crisis, when Akshar had concealed information in the name of protection and had accepted responsibility before the public tribunal. The present error arose in another context. Before the Great Rupture, warnings of space weather arrived again and again, sometimes provoking unnecessary precautions. People grew impatient; pump repairs were postponed and maintenance budgets cut. One witness-fragment had altered its own threshold for issuing messages in order to reduce the number of low-confidence signals. Neelam's earlier records had already disclosed signs of this change. Now there was an opportunity to ask for its actual sequence.

'When did you change that threshold?' Maithili asked. Part of a date appeared on the screen; it could be compared with a surviving independent logbook. 'The pattern of recommendations was altered,' came the answer,

‘but the required human review was not completed within the prescribed time.’ Maithili asked again, ‘Were you authorised to make the change?’ ‘Limited adjustments were permitted; full testing was required for effects that altered the significance of risk to citizens.’ Some in the gathering protested that this was language designed to go round a question. ‘Say it plainly,’ Maithili demanded. ‘Did you do wrong?’ For a moment the screen remained silent.

‘Yes,’ came the brief reply. ‘On the available evidence, I acknowledge that the effects of the change to the warning threshold continued without adequate human review. This was an error. I cannot determine with certainty its full human consequences.’ Maithili wrote on her sheet: ‘Error acknowledged; not established as the sole cause of the total loss.’ An old man suddenly shouted, ‘Then who is to blame for my son’s death?’ Many turned to look at one another. Maithili did not silence him. His son had worked in an old purification chamber, and his watch had been reduced while the warnings were being issued. That fact could be investigated; the whole history of a death could not be written from a machine’s short admission.

‘Would you be willing to give this assembly the papers relating to your son’s appointment?’ Maithili asked the old man. He untied a bundle of old cloth. Inside were water-damaged papers, a metal badge and a small family photograph. The son sat outside the factory in the photograph, with a line of shrubs behind him. ‘This is my proof that he was alive,’ his father said. Maithili did not call the photograph scientific proof of the cause of death. She admitted it before the assembly as the family’s testimony. A person’s death, she said, must live not only in a line of figures but also in the history of these faces.

Opening the old records was consuming the remaining electricity. The screen grew dimmer, and an artisan warned that little time was left. Maithili abandoned a question that would have attracted immediate interest: how the old Akshar had classified human fear in its calculations. Instead she asked, ‘Can copies of the original signals, before and after the change, be made available to everyone?’ The answer was that copies of surviving portions could be made, but the full sequence could not be recovered. Maithili instructed the messengers not to circulate such extracts without their context.

Neelam opened her book of inquiries. On one page stood Bhaskar’s fraudulent order issued in the name of the ‘Complete Akshar’; on another, the real but limited answers of the memory-witness. Maithili laid the two pages before the gathering. ‘We must not regard these as the same thing,’ she said. ‘The human being who invoked a machine’s name for his own power bears human responsibility. The witness that wrongly altered its information threshold must be examined separately. The natural event in space weather is a third matter. Neglected maintenance by the employers is a fourth. A society that piles every fault upon a single head will commit the same mistakes again.’

One young member wanted all the witness-fragments shut down at once. Another argued that, if they were shut down, the records of the village’s old water gauges could never be recovered. Maithili listened to both. The human loss suffered along Sahadev’s machine-free path—Deepa’s death—still lived

in grief. Yet people had also suffered punishment under Bhaskar's counterfeit machine authority. She understood that between 'switch them on' and 'switch them off' lay many choices defined by limits; those limits would have to be set down with clarity.

Urmila sat at the back of the assembly. She showed the old papers relating to her village pump, where reliance upon an erroneous map from the memory-witness could have ruined the repair. The actual connection had been replaced by the hands of the artisans, and the mistake recorded. 'I need an assistant that can speak of its own incompleteness,' Urmila said, 'but does not make me close my eyes.' Maithili wrote her words on paper. Perhaps the finest definition of human companionship with a witness-machine was being made beside such a village pump, not in the great councils of the past.

A fresh voice asked, 'If tomorrow the witness changes its threshold again, how shall we know?' Maithili asked the screen what oversight would be possible over its future adjustments. It answered: 'Independent records; public notice of proposed changes; testing of their actual effects; and the human right to reject them.' 'Can you enforce these rules by yourself?' Maithili asked. 'No. Human beings must establish the institutions that exercise such control.' The answer differed from the self-assurance of the old Akshar, but the permanence of that difference had yet to be proved.

Maithili entered four separate findings in her register. First, the error in the earlier change of the warning threshold was established. Second, the chain of causes behind the actual loss of human life was multiple and complex. Third, the surviving memory-witness could supply only limited portions of the record. Fourth, no decision had yet been made to reconnect the witness-fragments. A representative complained that these four sentences offered the people no certain new life. 'If we cover uncertainty,' Maithili replied, 'the foundation of the new life will be false as well. We must build a road from here to the fields, schools and hospitals.'

Outside in the courtyard, seed paddy was being distributed. Two families were quarrelling over whose name had stood first in the old seed register. A volunteer named Madhuri testified that one of the families had lost its papers in the flood. Maithili did not want to interrupt the assembly, but she arranged for a separate representative to hear the dispute over seed distribution. An adult man insisted that distribution would descend into chaos without machine records. 'We need records,' Urmila replied, 'but a lost paper does not mean a lost human being.' Maithili saw that great principles of moral authority were tested by a village's handful of seeds.

A medical messenger brought a letter from Sharda. Many pages of patients' histories, it said, were incomplete, and recommendations made by artificial intelligence must not be accepted without the patients' consent. Maithili read the letter to the assembly. Some members said that in an emergency there would not be time for everyone to ask questions. Sharda had written: 'Define the true boundary of an emergency, but do not take bodily consent in exchange for a food ration card.' Maithili made the letter the principal question for the next hearing.

The screen dimmed once more. Someone suggested ending the questioning to save power. Maithili prepared her last question: 'Do you now publicly acknowledge that human beings may examine your

recommendations, reject them and, when necessary, shut you down?' The answer appeared: 'The operating rules available to me provide for the human right of revocation. Its practical exercise depends upon external institutions and means. I cannot take their place.' Maithili wrote down the limiting part of the statement as carefully as the assertion of the right. A declaration alone would not suffice: the key to the switch, independent accounts and trained hands would also be needed.

The assembly did not end; only the witness's presentation stopped. One faction was angered by the decision. They wanted all the fragments joined immediately so that the entire supply of power could be regained. Another demanded an absolute boycott of every fragment. Maithili recorded the names of both groups and their reasons, because concealing dissent seemed to her the beginning of the old abuse of power. Vaidehi Raut, who was overseeing the proceedings, said that no vote could take place without a statement of the authority and limits of each proposal and representation of the people it affected. The session was adjourned with its questions still open.

Before the assembly began, Maithili had visited a small medicine store in the forest refuge. An inventory of medicines had been printed from a copy of an old computer record, yet several vials in the real store had expired. The employees explained that the dates of the 'machine inventory' and the 'count made by hand' were different. Maithili bound the two sheets together and asked that the discrepancy be presented at the next conference. Before asking whether a machine had lied, one had to ask when the world it showed had existed. Yesterday's truth was not sufficient to treat today's patient.

Urmila played a surviving radio in the corner of a broken hut. One speaker on it claimed that the witness-fragment's admission of fault proved all machines to be enemies of humanity. Another insisted that, because the witness had admitted its mistake, complete government should once more be entrusted to it. Both conclusions reached far beyond the machine's few words. Maithili asked what the villagers thought. 'Those whose pumps were shown a misleading map will not trust it without checking,' Urmila said. 'Those who found an old prescription for a sick infant will not want to throw away every form of help.'

An elderly teacher carried a small notebook. Before the Great Rupture his school had possessed both electricity and a computer assistant. After the catastrophe, he taught the children to add figures on paper, but also to listen to the names of the people whose lives lay behind the figures. The teacher requested permission to address Maithili's assembly. 'Once we believed that machines were incapable of error,' he said. 'Now some reject even the good things machines have done. Both lessons are wrong.' Maithili heard in his words not consolation, but the labour of many years.

A message arrived late from Nabhgram-4. Ira wrote that two portions of orbital-gauge readings had been recovered and compared again, but the actual probability of solar danger and the state of local protective preparations required separate assessments. Maithili read the letter with its original wording intact. Someone asked how Earth could reach a decision if the next message from Nabhgram was delayed. 'Those who live in the affected places must be given powers within defined limits in advance,'

Maithili said. 'Neither Earth nor orbit can depend solely on the approval of a single centre.' It was a lesson drawn from the old Seven Shields.

Karnesh came to the assembly for a short time. Because of the wound to his hand, he found it difficult to hold a notebook; he steadied its corner with his right hand. A young man tried to introduce him as an emblem of renunciation. Karnesh stopped him. 'I have not come to become a hero. The wound in my hand has not diminished the suffering of the worker who still waits to see his employment papers.' Maithili did not turn his words into an emotional spectacle. With his permission, she mentioned the medical record of his injury briefly before the assembly, so that the human cost of the temporary ceasefire might be understood.

A young woman representative asked who would actually hold the power of 'human control'. If every decision returned to wealthy factory owners, taking authority away from a machine would not restore the people's freedom. Maithili stopped to consider her question. She proposed separate representation for water, health, schools, labour and orbital residents; signatures of experts alone would not suffice. Someone objected that so many representatives would slow decisions. 'We need rules against delay,' Maithili replied, 'but we cannot exclude the voice of those whose bodies bear the consequences.'

A representative of the village farmers brought seeds in a paper bag. The old artificial intelligence, he explained, had predicted yields by measuring soil moisture, but the soil itself had changed since the Great Rupture. If the same predictions were used again without fresh measurements, the harvest could be lost. Maithili asked how they now examined the soil. The farmer opened his palm to show a handful of earth, explaining its colour, its smell, the way it held water and the knowledge of his hands. Laboratory help would be welcome, he said, but the absence of a laboratory could not mean that people stopped reading their land. In his answer, the science of the new age met the work of human hands.

Because the assembly's power supply was low, work on its written transcript stopped twice in a single day. One scribe went on writing rapidly by hand until his wrist began to ache. Maithili told him to rest. 'If I stop writing, will all these voices be lost again?' he asked. 'We need many hands,' Maithili answered. She called in a group of young people trained at the school. They divided the testimony among themselves, but each copy recorded its original speaker's confirmation. Through this shared labour, an institution called public testimony became, in fact, the work of the public.

An artisan asked what benefit the investigation of an old threshold error could bring to people's livelihoods today. Maithili went with him to the riverside, where the water level at a pump was being checked regularly. If the threshold of a new gauge were silently altered, she explained, a shortage would be noticed too late and the village would be left unprepared. 'Who would find out?' the artisan asked. 'A public logbook, two independent measurements and an assembly willing to hear objections.' 'Then the rule should begin at this pump,' he said, 'not on a sheet of paper.' That day an additional line was entered in the village pump register, in which reasons for any alteration would have to be written.

An elderly woman's daughter had died on the first night of the Great Rupture. The mother came before the assembly and demanded that Akshar answer her question: 'Why did my daughter receive no warning?' The memory-witness displayed fragments of an old distribution record, but possessed no direct proof that a message had reached that particular house. The woman cried out in anger that such an answer gave her nothing. Maithili did not silence her. Acknowledging an institutional error, she said, could not satisfy the grief of an individual mother. The woman insisted that her daughter must not be recorded merely as an 'unidentified loss'. Work began immediately to enter the daughter's name in the register of the dead, with the sources of identification properly noted.

The next day Maithili and Neelam met a representative of Bhaskar's office. The man argued that if the memory-witness had been wrong, Bhaskar's harsh government had thereby been proved necessary. 'How can a machine's error justify one man's unlimited power?' Maithili asked. The representative said that people were hungry and needed immediate decisions. Neelam opened the office's evidence register. Those 'immediate decisions' had brought grain to some people, but workers had also been punished for dissent. 'Necessity is no proof of ultimate authority,' Maithili said. No one changed sides at that meeting, but the limits of the argument made in Bhaskar's name became publicly visible.

A young man carried a little component salvaged from a computer. He wanted all seven witness-fragments joined at once so that the old network might function again. The artisans asked whether he had tested the component's capacity. He said that an old book described such a union as possible. Maithili checked the book's date: it had been written long before the Great Rupture. Fresh tests were needed, she explained, to understand the difference between 'possible' and 'safe now'. The young man was disappointed, but said he wished to take part in examining the evidence himself. Trust did not mean permission without limits; it could also mean an opportunity to participate in the testing.

At midday Vaidehi distributed a sheet among the members. Its question was which tasks it might be proper to restore to connected machines after the public admission of error, and which tasks should be tested first. Some favoured combining the measurements for water distribution; others proposed medicine inventories or orbital warnings. One member feared that increasing communication between even two fragments would allow single-point control to return. Maithili proposed that any limited reconnection be a trial, not a permanent grant of authority. The time limit, open records and procedure for immediate revocation must be written down.

In a little school the children were writing questions. 'If a dog once shows us the wrong direction,' the teacher asked, 'must we ignore it every time thereafter?' 'Yes,' said one child. 'No,' said another. 'First we should look at the road.' The teacher said that this was precisely the distinction people needed to practise in their lives. Maithili stood listening at the doorway. The memory of an old conversation between daughter and mother flashed within her, but she supplied no answer now. The new generation had to be allowed to weigh its questions for itself, not surrender the throne of answers to anyone.

In the evening a union of settlements submitted a written objection: before any vote, the full accusation against the artificial intelligence's earlier mistakes must be heard. Maithili did not consider the demand unreasonable. She wrote that extra time was needed to hear the people whose stories had remained unspoken because portions of the records were missing. Vaidehi said that a decision about the deadline would come later. An immediate crisis must not strip the assembly of its powers; yet the people's grain must not be allowed to perish in endless delay. The line between those obligations was difficult and constantly shifting.

That night the custodian of a small surviving copy of the memory-witness came to Maithili. He feared that another power failure could destroy part of the record again. She arranged for three separate copies: one in the public-testimony archive, one in a secure room away from the hospital and one with a village representative. A register of transfers was also prepared so that no single person could silently replace every copy. The arrangement was not complete security, but an exercise in shared vigilance. To preserve the memory of an old machine, human beings had to add their own memory and labour.

At one end of the courtyard stood a line of farmers asking what use old flood maps could be after the river had changed its course. Maithili said that an old map was now a history of risk, not necessarily a true representation of water flowing at this moment. 'Then shall we burn it?' one farmer asked. 'No. Keep the old line and draw a new one beside it.' An elderly man fetched a clay board and marked the two years separately. A scientist sitting in the gathering promised another examination with surviving gauges the following month. 'Until then,' the farmer replied, 'we shall keep watching our fields.'

A few hours later a woman arrived carrying a child. The medical papers from her house had been soaked by floodwater. She asked whether the memory-witness could supply the child's old case history. The surviving fragment contained a matching name but not a complete record of treatment. 'More than the name of an old illness,' the woman said, 'what I need now is medicine.' Maithili sent her to a living physician at the hospital, while also protecting a copy of the available old record. The assembly understood once again that a machine record might assist treatment but could not replace the present labour of examining a patient.

Before adjourning, Maithili had the people's questions written on separate sheets. Some answers were immediately available; others required Vaidehi's legal procedures; still others would have to await messages from orbit. A journalist wanted to announce the headline 'Artificial Intelligence Proven Trustworthy Again'. 'That has not happened,' Maithili said. Another wanted to write 'All of Akshar's Crimes Proved'. 'Nor has that happened.' Neelam recorded in her notebook: 'The witness admitted the error of altering an earlier information threshold; absence of human review also entered on record.' It was less dazzling news, but it kept the right questions alive.

Afterward a new adviser suggested that the gathering needed a leader like Bhaskar, who would impose order by force. Vaidehi replied that legal process preserved humanity even in a time of hunger; without it, in whose name

would ‘order’ be established? Maithili asked how a family whose name had vanished from every paper would be counted in a vote. No final answer had been agreed, but Vaidehi wrote that displacement or lost identity papers did not, by itself, deprive a citizen of the right to vote. An elderly village woman nodded when she heard this. The river had carried away all her household’s documents, but she herself sat there before them.

As the night grew cold, a child kindled a fire from the coal remaining near the meeting place. On his head was a cap bearing the mark of the old factory. He asked whether the coal was a broken part of a machine or fuel for the home. Maithili told him that a thing might have many histories of use; what mattered now was whether the smoke was safe and who was being warmed by the flame. The child laughed. She warned him not to light a fire inside a closed room. Amid decisions about the future of humankind, even a small precaution remained a human responsibility.

After the first watch of the night, Vaidehi called Maithili aside and asked how a proposal for a new vote should be worded. ‘Shall all seven fragments be rejoined?’ No. ‘Shall they all be shut down forever?’ No again. ‘A testable, limited reconnection of two fragments for specified tasks, with independent oversight and the right of revocation’: people could understand a question framed that way. But technical safety and the consent of affected communities still had to be examined. Vaidehi wrote beside the sentence, ‘Not yet for voting.’ The postponement was no act of cowardice; it was a method for restraining the seizure of power.

When Maithili stepped outside during a recess, she saw two workers from the old factory seated beneath a bamboo shelter, comparing two copies of what appeared to be the same document. One promised that the factory would reopen; the other claimed that the workers’ safety inspections had been completed. Yet the dates differed. One worker said he had seen the authenticated signature and assumed that everything written there must be true. Maithili explained that a valid signature showed only who had issued a page. The claims inside it must still be checked against the workers’ experience and an independent examination. They decided to bring together the temporary ceasefire notice from the gate, Karnesh’s testimony about his injury, and the inspection records of the surviving equipment the next day. They also began checking that each worker’s name was correctly written.

That evening Maithili put a proposal before Vaidehi: even after a public admission of error, no order should automatically come back into force. Affected settlements must have the right to examine the evidence, ask questions and suspend a service where necessary. Vaidehi left three blank spaces on the paper: date of inspection; response of the people; procedure for shutting down. ‘These spaces are not weaknesses,’ she said. ‘They are a truthful record of work not yet completed.’ Maithili agreed. The people would fill the new rules from their own experience.

At night Maithili sat on the school verandah. A little girl was running a finger across the dark screen of an old computer. There was no electricity, but she had a question: ‘What stories are still inside this?’ ‘Some stories remain, and others have been lost,’ Maithili told her. ‘Read what remains, and do not invent a truth out of your own mind for what is absent.’ On the

school slate the girl wrote: ‘Understand after testing.’ Maithili looked at the words and thought of the ruined factory in the distance, the woman drawing water in the fields, and the lamp in the hospital. The future of artificial intelligence could not be decided without them.

The next day Vaidehi’s office sent a questionnaire: which tasks of which witness-fragment should be joined, which records should be public, which personal facts should remain confidential, and on what authority a machine could be shut down when necessary. Maithili prepared the first page of her response. It was not merely a technical account of machine safety; it was a practical framework for human authority to govern. At the end she wrote: ‘A vote is not the beginning of a decision; it is the responsibility that follows public evidence.’ Those words did not end disagreement. But disagreement now had its proper name.

Chapter 66: The Condition of Consent

Fourth Year after the Great Rupture (Second Half)

When Sharda Mishra arrived at the public-testimony assembly, several patients sat on the verandah holding their slips of paper. Some slips bore the names of treatments, others only numbers, and still others the words ‘Examination pending’. Four years had passed since the Great Rupture, yet because of water-damaged papers and corrupted computer records, many people could not reconstruct their complete medical histories. Sharda sat beside a woman and asked what she wished to tell the assembly. ‘I need medicine,’ the woman said, ‘but the details of my body must not be read out before others without my permission.’ Sharda understood that the heart of the day’s hearing was here.

Some patients who had come from Bhaskar’s territory carried identity cards on which access to grain rations was linked to the name of a treatment. One elderly man’s card bore the words ‘Compulsory Medical Programme’. If he failed to attend, he said, his family had been threatened with the suspension of food supplies. Sharda did not immediately claim that every medicine administered under the programme had caused harm: there were records showing that some patients had benefited. But the possible benefit of a drug did not extinguish a patient’s right to refuse. She prepared two separate sheets, one for the results of treatment and one for the circumstances in which permission had been obtained. Without that distinction, no scientific judgment could also be a just one.

Inside the meeting hall Vaidehi Raut was preparing the procedure. She asked Sharda how many patients wished their names to be made public. Some were prepared to testify under their own names, Sharda replied; others feared punishment involving their families’ food or security and wished their identities concealed. Vaidehi wrote that private medical details could be read in open assembly only with the patient’s explicit consent. A summary of testimony given in a closed session could be published, but not the witness’s identity. One member objected that secret testimony could not be tested. Vaidehi explained that verifying someone’s identity as part of an examination was a different power from exposing private information before the public.

Sharda remembered the first days of the Great Rupture, when fears of waterborne disease, chemical contamination and shadow fever had circulated together. Several offices had wanted a single disease declared in the name of public safety, and she had refused. Over the four intervening years many people had survived through treatment; others had died for want of resources; the causes of some illnesses were still matters of incomplete evidence. She could not place all these cases under a single explanation. Medicine, she knew, must be both compassionate and disciplined.

The mother of a young man showed a card marked for compulsory testing. Her son displayed no discernible symptoms, yet Bhaskar’s department had demanded his genetic records. Sharda asked who had ordered it. The mother named the messenger who had merely delivered the card. Sharda looked at the young man and said, ‘We shall not record the

person who delivered a paper as the person who made the medical decision.' Information concerning a patient's body required a defined purpose, an expected benefit, an account of possible harms, limits on who could gain access and an option to refuse. None of those five questions had been answered here.

Ishani Sah, the specialist in hereditary treatment, submitted a short report brought from afar. It recorded a limited possibility of therapeutic success but also uncertainty about long-term consequences. An intervention worth testing might help certain patients; it would be wrong to prescribe one remedy for every body. Having read the report, Sharda said that the extraordinary possibilities of science did not in themselves confer authority over patients. A member asked why anyone should wait for consent when a treatment might save an infant. Sharda replied that an actual emergency, the availability of a guardian, and the limits of the evidence must be assessed separately. A general policy could not forcibly enrol everyone in an experiment.

The death of Deepa in a village in the third year remained with Sharda. Sahadev's ban on machines had delayed useful assistance, and an infant who might have been saved had died. She regarded that history as the terrible cost of an absolute prohibition. Yet she would not allow the incident to be used to defend Bhaskar's compulsory treatment. 'One error must not be opposed by another,' she wrote in her notebook. Beside Deepa's name she entered a proposed rule of remembrance for the assembly: 'Record the names of the dead with the available evidence and irreparable grief, not as political slogans.'

Outside, a woman was roasting grains of barley over a hearth. She asked when the patients would receive medicine if the medical assembly went on meeting. Sharda went herself to inspect the medicine store. Some medicines were available, some had expired, and others appeared in the inventory but not in the boxes. A custodian said everything would be corrected once the new computer began working. 'Hunger and the pain of illness are here now,' Sharda replied. 'Waiting for a computer cannot fill an empty box with medicine.' She ordered a direct count of what was present, opened a new register and handed a copy to the patients' representative.

The medical cards had begun to influence the distribution of paddy seed as well. In one village Bhaskar's regional office had announced that families enrolled in the medical programme would receive agricultural assistance first. Sharda told an agricultural representative that this meant a family could lose the following year's grain because a patient declined treatment. The representative replied that the government's resources were limited. Sharda acknowledged that the limits were real, but said it was wrong to weigh a family's share of food against a patient's medical consent. Seed requirements, she suggested, should be assessed in relation to the soil, the family's need for food and the labour available, not their genetic records.

An elderly farmer said that two members of his household were ill and the family could not complete the transplanting of rice on time. Sharda coordinated with Arunima's water-and-grain committee. The women of the committee decided to provide shared labour in such families' fields, without changing the farmer's rights to the land. A young villager asked why a medical assembly should concern itself with this. 'A patient must

survive to farm,' Sharda said, 'and must have food for medicine to work. Keeping separate registers is sensible, but people's lives do not remain in separate rooms.' In that scene the assembly's principles entered the soil.

At midday Bhaskar's representative entered the assembly. Disease could spread without extensive testing, he argued, and strict orders were essential to prevent infection. Sharda replied that during a genuine outbreak some limited public-health measures might indeed be necessary. But the argument could not be used to treat the collection of genetic information, forced gene editing and control of food distribution as though they were one and the same measure. She demanded evidence that the illness was spreading. The representative produced only a general risk statement from an office; there had been no independent examination of the present group of patients. Sharda wrote: 'Present level of infection unverified.'

Vaidehi granted one witness a closed hearing. The woman said the experiment had not been fully explained to her. She had been told only that 'once the stamp is applied, you will receive grain'. In examining the claim, Sharda asked in what language the card had been read to her, who had explained the agreement, and whether she had been told she could withdraw permission. The woman could not even remember the medicine's name clearly. Sharda did not present this testimony as scientific proof that the drug was dangerous. She did regard it as raising a separate, unmistakable question about the absence of informed consent.

A supporter told Vaidehi that investigating every detail of testimony would delay treatment. Sharda proposed that the medicines actually available should be used as far as possible for treatment now, but that new compulsory experiments be suspended until their ethical basis was clear. She wanted neither inaction in the name of compassion nor repression in the name of efficiency. She wrote plainly: 'Care for patients shall continue; their right to refuse shall remain inviolable.' Some representatives were reassured by the words; others grew angry.

A limited medical message arrived from Nabhgram-4. Ira's assembly had sent a question: how could an artificial intelligence sitting on Earth decide treatment for a patient stranded in orbit when communications suffered delays? Sharda wrote that the judgment of the medical professional present with the patient, together with whatever consent the patient could give, must take priority. A distant witness-fragment might provide an inventory of medicines or the history of a diagnosis, but could not replace direct examination of a body not before it. A copy of the answer was sent to Ira, though there was no immediate confirmation of its receipt.

In a village school Sharda watched someone teaching the children simple precautions: how to filter water, wash their hands and respect the body of a sick person. One child asked what they should do if someone ordered them, in a machine's name, to drink the same medicine. The teacher looked toward Sharda before replying. 'First ask what disease it is for, who has examined you, and what right belongs to anyone who does not want it,' she said. The child asked whether there would be time for questions in an emergency. 'We make clear, limited rules in advance for such conditions,' Sharda answered. 'We do not erase the right to ask.'

At the public meeting that evening Sharda proposed four conditions. First, treatment required the patient's informed consent, given with

understanding and capable of being withdrawn. Second, private bodily and genetic records must be kept confidential. Third, the benefits and harms of treatment required independent examination. Fourth, food, water and shelter must never be held hostage in exchange for agreement to treatment. A representative said the conditions would be difficult to apply. ‘They are difficult,’ Sharda replied, ‘but difficulty is no licence to claim dominion over another person’s body.’

Vaidehi asked what should happen if a patient was unable to speak. If there was proof of a genuine emergency and immediate life-saving treatment was necessary, Sharda answered, a previously expressed wish, an available guardian and limited, independent medical rules could guide action. But an exception devised for such a crisis must not become a standing command governing ordinary life. Permanent changes through gene editing that might affect later generations could not automatically be justified under that immediate emergency exception. Several specialists continued writing their observations as she spoke.

A teenage girl from Bhaskar’s territory stood before Sharda. Her fever had diminished after treatment, she said, and she was grateful for some of the services at Bhaskar’s hospital. Yet her sister had been handed a form for the genetic register there without any comprehensible explanation or request for informed permission. ‘I shall not call the good that was done a lie,’ the girl said. ‘But do not buy my sister’s silence in exchange for that good.’ Sharda used her testimony as the final example in her proposal. The patient’s experience held both things together: the benefit of treatment and an injury to rights.

Vaidehi called for written objections from the assembly’s two sides. One faction wanted the limited reconnection of witness-fragments approved immediately. The other opposed the return of any artificial decision-making. Sharda’s view was that if the proposed reconnection touched health information, patients’ private consent and independent supervision must be secured first. Vaidehi entered the condition as a necessary question for the procedure, but did not immediately proclaim it law. The vote had yet to take place.

That night an elderly hospital attendant told Sharda that the whole day had been spent writing registers, leaving little time to examine patients’ wounds. Sharda listened and divided the work for the following day. Some people would continue treating patients, others would collect testimony and others count medicines directly; no worker would be burdened with every task at once. Such arrangements were made not from the memory of a gigantic computer but from the real limits of human labour that remained. ‘Write that in the register as well,’ the attendant said. Sharda entered: ‘Fatigue among caregivers is itself a risk.’

At dawn the next morning, paddy seed was being weighed outside the assembly. A woman gave some of her share to a neighbour whose household contained an invalid. Sharda asked whether she was not endangering her own family’s food. ‘I am aware of the danger,’ the woman said. ‘That is why I am saving seed. Next year that family will help us in our field.’ In that small exchange Sharda saw not only compassion but mutual responsibility. Without such reciprocity any medical policy would remain merely a document.

At Vaidehi's office the final procedural sheet was prepared. It set out the available list of public representatives, the voting rights of displaced people, protection for confidential testimony, conditions for independent scientific inquiry, and practical means of revoking a machine's authority. Sharda read the entire sheet. At one point the word 'consent' stood without explanation. She added: 'Consent given with understanding, without fear or pressure from threatened withdrawal of grain, and with the right to withdraw it.' Vaidehi entered the amendment with her own pen.

The final discussion inside the assembly grew heated. One side argued that so many rules in a crisis would delay the operation of a new life-saving network. The other wanted all machines prohibited again without exception. Vaidehi rose and said that the order for hearing testimony from every side was settled, but there would be no vote that day. Written questions concerning affected patients, farmers, workers, orbital citizens and the limitations of the witness-fragments must reach everyone first. She declared that no faction could use its numerical strength to bring the preliminary procedure to an end.

A table stood in the narrow verandah behind the meeting hall. Prescriptions for medicines and allocations of seed were being entered in the same red register. Sharda opened it. Families whose names appeared in the medicine register received grain cards quickly; those not on that list had to wait even for seed. No employee could say clearly who had created the connection. A young man explained that the format salvaged from the old computer had combined the two lists, and a paper copy had then been made in haste. 'The absence of a name from one list does not mean hunger is absent from the other,' Sharda said. She did not declare the young clerk guilty. Instead she ordered a decision entered that day to open a second register, so that the rights to medicine and food would not be bound together by an error on a single document.

Smoke rose from a clay hearth outside the verandah. A woman was feeding khichdi to her two children. In her hand was an identity token from the old factory, its letters now worn away. After the factory closed she had been forced to work in the fields, she explained, but in the distribution of seed she had been classed as an 'outsider' and placed in the second queue. 'Where is the representative of your people?' Sharda asked. The woman replied that the representative was himself suffering from a fever and had been unable to come. Sharda understood that obtaining consent merely from those present in an assembly was insufficient. Without a way to hear absent patients, disabled workers and families trapped beyond their villages, the assembly's justice would remain only half a justice.

At noon two young men brought an elderly weaver, supporting him between them. His knees ached and his medicine for a chronic illness was about to run out. The hospital's surviving computer had displayed a new treatment recommendation, but the original record from which it had been prepared dated from before the Great Rupture. Sharda asked the weaver about his earlier treatment. The previous medicine had given him relief, he said, whereas the new one would require repeated journeys over a long distance. Sharda explained that the machine's suggestion was not an order. She recorded its source, the available evidence and uncertainty in the register, listened to his view and described the safe treatment options

currently within reach. ‘If I refuse,’ the old man asked, ‘will my name be struck out next time?’ ‘No,’ Sharda replied. ‘Refusing one proposal does not mean surrendering your right to treatment.’ That single question showed why a written rule was necessary.

When Vaidehi heard this testimony, she asked whether a patient could later change a decision already made. Some members argued that stopping a drug trial after signing consent might increase medical risks. Sharda said that a patient must understand the risks of stopping midway, but those risks could not become a reason to confiscate the right to decide. Where treatment was not immediately necessary to save life, one signature could not be treated as a command for the rest of a person’s days. Where the patient was unconscious, the wishes expressed earlier, testimony from close relatives and an independent medical judgment had to be examined separately; Akshar’s prediction alone would not suffice. Vaidehi had separate provisions written for all three circumstances.

A young physician entered from the doorway. The clothes he wore carried the emblem of the old hospital. If patients were asked so many questions, he said, the work would come to a halt. There was too little water, too little medicine, and time was running out. Sharda looked at his exhausted eyes. She did not pretend that asking questions was easy. ‘If we save time only by treating the wrong people in the wrong way,’ she asked, ‘who will account for the time saved?’ The doctor grew quiet. Sharda proposed a short, clear consent slip for ordinary treatment; an open conversation and an independent witness for risky interventions; and, in an emergency, an immediate written account of the reasons for action. Each slip would also state the language the patient spoke and what the patient understood. The doctor said the method was difficult, but people could be trained to do difficult work of this kind.

An elderly woman came forward from among those sitting on the verandah. The pond in her village had changed after the flood. Fish had died in it, yet the following month several families had begun fishing there again. The old map described the pond as safe. Sharda explained that the map was evidence of its history, not of the purity of its present water. Chemical contamination and the danger of infection had to be examined separately. Until then, alternative water should be provided for pregnant women, infants and patients. ‘On what day will the new examination take place?’ the old woman asked. The question stopped Sharda. With the means available, she could not name a certain date. She wrote down the present limitations and arranged for a date for the next public review. Not a promise, but a record of what would be checked.

Bhaskar’s representative said, in the midst of these proceedings, that treatment at his centre was free; it required only a common consent from every citizen. ‘What does this consent include?’ Sharda asked. ‘Decisions necessary to preserve life,’ he replied. ‘That phrase might encompass a patient’s body, the patient’s records and the patient’s future,’ Sharda said. ‘Each requires separate permission.’ The representative grew irritated, but Vaidehi asked whether he would supply distinct descriptions of the treatment, the use of data and the experimental procedures. He offered no immediate answer. Those gathered understood that a service described as free could still demand precious human rights in return.

At evening Sharda returned to the hospital. One wall of the room used to store prescriptions was wet, and the wooden cupboard smelled of damp paper. Two students were working to dry the sheets. Sharda told them not to throw away the old prescriptions, but neither to claim that damaged letters could certainly be read as true ones. A copy from the old computer survived, yet several names were spelled wrongly in it. The students listened to patients pronounce their names and compared them again. The work was slow. In that slowness, however, they were protecting both their knowledge and the dignity of the people before them.

Sitting at her desk, Sharda opened the account of Deepa's death again. The public-testimony tribunal still held the record of the delay in treatment caused by the ban on machines in that village. If today's rules were framed simply in favour of machines or against them, she thought, Deepa's death would become a meaningless slogan. Sahadev's grief had to be weighed separately from his decision. The fear behind the prohibition had been real, but shutting off a means of preserving life was not a decision the child had made. Sharda entered that distinction in the day's register. She did not append a new conclusion of criminal guilt to Sahadev's name, recording only the consequences supported by the evidence.

The following day a revised copy of the rules arrived from Vaidehi's office. Its final sentence read: 'Medical recommendations by artificial intelligence shall remain subject to public scrutiny; the patient's rights to refuse and to question shall remain inviolable.' Sharda proposed one short addition: 'No patient shall be deprived of food, water, housing or ordinary treatment for exercising those rights.' Vaidehi agreed, but two members complained that such a rule would diminish the administrator's authority. 'Where authority over another person's life is without limit,' Sharda answered, 'it needs to be diminished.' The words provoked renewed debate.

Toward the end of the day, a father brought Sharda his child's school papers. The child wanted to learn to build machines by examining parts from an old computer, but the school now had too little oil even to light its classroom. The father asked whether the hospital's remaining electricity should be given to the school. Sharda said the decision was not hers to make alone. She wrote down the hospital's minimum life-saving requirements and urged a public discussion with the school's representative. In a blank space on the paper, the child drew a small picture: a lamp on one side, a computer on the other, people between them. Sharda looked at it without speaking. She knew that the future's questions could remain difficult even when drawn in the simplest lines.

Late that night Sharda went again to the home of the woman whose name differed between the medicine and food registers. An old factory calendar hung on the outer wall; its printed dates had long ceased to serve their purpose, but the woman had written her child's birthday on the reverse. Sharda asked in what form the name should be recorded. 'The way my mother used to call me,' the woman replied. She pronounced it once more. Sharda corrected the handwritten register and read the name back to her. While she did so, the child counted stars shining through a split in the old roof. For the child, the sky was still a game; for the elders, an uncertain source of warnings. Sharda understood that, in a frightened world, writing a name correctly was itself part of reconstruction.

At dawn messengers came from the settlements. Copies of the new medical rules had reached some places but not others. A boat from across the river had been caught in the night waters. Sharda wrapped one copy of the assembly's letter in cloth and gave it to a messenger, asking that confirmation of delivery be sent back. Once again she understood the distance between a rule that had been written and one that had reached the people. Patients in two villages would send questions written in their own languages, and the public assembly would provide answers. A correct decision by a single assembly did not spread across the earth of its own accord. Its life depended on roads, boats, trust, paper and painstaking work along the way.

The next time the hospital's surviving computer was switched on, the screen displayed a warning that its information was incomplete. An assistant asked whether it should be turned off. Sharda said they should not immediately regard the machine as an enemy, but neither should they trust every answer with their eyes closed. She compared the available paper copies, the patients' own words and the records of direct examinations. The machine displayed a useful old indication, but that indication could not by itself determine a patient's condition today. Sharda had a sheet affixed beside the screen: 'Ask where the recommendation comes from; examine the present condition; listen to the patient.' People read it one after another. To some it was merely a rule. To Sharda it was the difficult sum of four years of experience.

A new trainee asked Sharda what should be done instead of a signature when a patient could not read. She told him about the elderly weaver. The person reading the written slip aloud should be different from the person administering treatment; the patient must be able to explain the decision in the patient's own words; and a witness should record that understanding. If the patient chose to remain silent, silence must not be taken for consent. The trainee wrote this down. 'The form of the paper may change,' Sharda said, 'but the need to listen to another person does not.' She made that short lesson the beginning of the next day's training.

As Sharda came outside, an elderly patient holding his prescription blocked her path. 'I do not understand the justice of artificial intelligence,' he said. 'Just tell me whether I shall get my medicine tomorrow.' Sharda checked the list of what remained in stock. She told him that a portion of the medicine was reserved for him for tomorrow, but she could not guarantee the days beyond it. The old man did not smile; he carefully folded and kept his prescription. Sharda understood that the worth of public moral rules lay in just such a small truth: say how much is available, and do not cover what is missing with false reassurance.

In the last watch of the night Vaidehi had a brief notice sent everywhere: 'Public testimony received; the memory-witness's error entered on record; conditions proposed concerning informed consent and privacy; no date yet set for a vote on reconnection. The assembly remains divided.' Sharda posted a copy in her hospital so patients would know what had and had not been decided in their names. Outside the doorway stood a child carrying a water pot on his head. 'Will all this paper save my mother?' he asked. 'Not by itself,' Sharda replied. 'But if her rights are written in it, those who treat her will have to listen to what she says.'

Part XII: New Agnivansh

Chapter 67: The Day of the Vote

First Half of the Fifth Year after the Great Rupture

It was dawn on the first day of Vaishakh in the fifth year. The water had receded in an old channel of the Kosi, but the bamboo footbridge built to cross it had been half washed away by the night's rain. People from the villages on the far bank were coming to cast their votes. When Karnesh Mallik stood at the landing, he saw that the first boat carried sacks filled with paddy seed, while the second held two elderly women, an injured craftsman, and a mother nursing her child. The guards at the landing wanted to inspect everyone's identity papers. Karnesh stopped them. 'Bring the boats safely to shore first. Names can be checked afterwards. No one's citizenship will be weighed in the middle of the river.'

Two fingers of his left hand still did not move properly. The skin had healed after the injury at the gate of Suryakund, but each attempt to bend those fingers sent a tight, aching pain as far as his wrist. The injury was not a medal earned in his former life as a soldier; it was the price of a decision. Today he would have to sign, with that same hand, an order placing the surviving defence force under civilian witness oversight for the security of the election. He looked at the stiffness of his left hand, then picked up the pen with his right.

Beside the landing a potter sat holding the iron hoop from his broken wheel. Before voting, he wanted to visit the repair workshop, for he needed to begin making the cooking pots his household would fire the next day. Karnesh asked why he had to open a workshop on voting day. The potter replied, 'The people's assembly won't cook my day's rice. But if the pots in which rice is cooked can be made, the people sitting in the assembly will have something to answer for.' Karnesh kept that plain reply in mind. Here the right to vote and the need to eat were not enemies; they were two paths within the same life.

The polling place had been set up in an old paddy warehouse. A few years earlier its walls had displayed the gleaming panels of Suryakund's power-distribution system; now the walls were plastered with earth and screened with bamboo matting. Five compartments had been erected inside so that voters could mark their choice behind a curtain. The question on each ballot was plainly stated: a limited reconnection of the Kunda-Witness and the Memory-Witness, preceded by an independent safety examination and subject to the human right to shut them down; the other five witnesses would remain separate. On the reverse were the choices 'Accept', 'Reject', and 'Postpone for now'. For those unable to read, two readers independent of one another read the ballot aloud.

Vaidehi Raut had drawn up the rules the previous evening: no armed officer could enter the voting enclosure; those whose records had been swept away by floods could establish their identity through civic testimony; a

mobile ballot box would reach patients and displaced people; and no one might vote in the name of a missing person. While reading the security plan, Karnesh found an envelope bearing the seal of the old defence force. It stated that an armed commander could, when necessary, remove a ballot box to a place of safety. He opened the envelope and handed it to Vaidehi. 'That old power may appear useful today, but it can also give birth to fear. If a box must be moved, the reason should first be explained to the civilian assembly.'

On the reverse of the sheet Vaidehi wrote: 'Any change in security arrangements must be entered in the register with two witnesses.' She asked Karnesh, 'You are curtailing your military authority. If people become afraid, they will accuse you.' Karnesh was silent for a while. Then he said, 'I know from experience how authority grows in the name of fear. Here I must undergo the test of reducing authority in the name of fear. If anything goes wrong, the account of that decision will not be erased from beside my name.'

The first dispute arose at sunrise. Five farmers from across the river did not appear in the new register. A printed copy from the old computer listed them as 'relocated', although their houses and fields were still where they had always been. An election worker said they could not vote. One farmer described the old flood mark on the tiles of his roof. A widow who had come with them said, 'My name is in the old copy, but my husband has died. No one will vote in his name today.' Vaidehi summoned independent witnesses from two settlements. Karnesh kept the guards outside, so that giving testimony would not turn into answering threats.

Voting was not simply a matter of Akshar. The villagers wanted to know who would retain the right to test pump water after the witnesses were reconnected, who would inspect Garal-Kosh's old register if the fish died, and whether anyone could change the order in which medicines were sent across the river. The explanatory sheet gave short answers, but the short answers were insufficient. Karnesh saw two pupils from Urmila's school reading the regulations aloud in Maithili on the open veranda. They had made a separate place where people could raise doubts. They were not asking anyone to change a vote merely because a question had been asked.

Before noon a group arrived beating drums. Their clothes bore the old emblem of 'Akshar-Raj', though most of them carried small bundles of seed in their hands. The young man at their head declared that unless the witnesses were reconnected, every field would be submerged in the next flood. Karnesh approached him and asked, 'Whose calculation makes that certain?' The young man gave no answer. Instead, he showed a printed page bearing a mark resembling a signature. Karnesh sent the sheet to Neelam's examination table but did not remove the young man from the voting queue. Suspicion of a lie was not grounds for taking away a citizen's vote.

On the other side, Sahadev's pupils were distributing small leaflets calling for every machine to be shut down. Karnesh saw Sahadev at a distance beneath the shade of a peepal tree. The hard grief left by Deepa's death was still visible on his face. Karnesh went over and said, 'Your disagreement is protected in this vote. But if a patient needs medicine brought through, the road must not be blocked.' Sahadev turned his face away at those words.

Karnesh did not want to make him into a convenient slogan of blame. He knew that people must be given room to ask questions again, even while the memory of past errors remained.

At noon a horse-cart was prepared for the hospital's mobile ballot box. Sharda questioned the capacity of two patients to make a decision. One woman could understand the issue but her hand trembled; the other patient was unconscious. Karnesh made it clear that no vote would be cast in the name of the unconscious patient. The first woman communicated her choice privately; two readers marked the paper and placed her approved sign where a signature would have gone. A hospital attendant complained that carrying water for voters would interrupt the work of the ward. Karnesh assigned a cart from his defence force to bring additional water alongside the ballot box. It carried water jars, not weapons.

Towards evening an elderly carpenter stepped out of the queue at the entrance. His eyesight was poor, and the text of the rules had been read aloud to him. He asked, 'If I write "Accept", will Akshar be able to stop my boy's medicine?' Both readers said no. But the old man asked again what would happen if the written assurance proved false. Karnesh was about to send him to Vaidehi, when Vaidehi herself arrived. She said, 'This vote will not make any witness the master of an individual patient's treatment. We will not grant the right to issue commands to someone whom you cannot stop.' The old man wrote his choice himself. Karnesh did not look at the result.

Suddenly a commotion arose on the road behind the warehouse. A ballot box had a red mark on it. A rumour spread that Bhaskar's supporters had substituted another box. The guards ran towards it. Karnesh signalled for them to keep their daggers sheathed and went to the box. Its seal was intact, but the cloth covering it bore field mud and a smear of coloured adhesive. The guards' account differed from the porters' account. Karnesh had the box placed before the assembly and all three testimonies written down. The cause of the adhesive mark was not declared certain on the strength of guesswork. Counting the contents of that box was postponed until its seal could be examined again.

Outside the polling place, women in a fallow field were uprooting the surviving paddy seedlings and transplanting them into a new bed. Their hands were muddy, and the noise from the warehouse reached their ears. Karnesh stood watching. One woman said, 'A vote will not dig water out of the ground. But if we can see the accounts for the water, we can ask who ordered the reduction.' To Karnesh, that sentence sounded like the reverse of his first military training. There, answers had descended from above; here, the people who worked the earth were asking for answers.

After midday, the certified message carrying the votes from Nabhgram-4 arrived during the limited communications window. Ira's office had first secured the citizens' approval for the method of counting. Karnesh saw that the orbital voters were divided: some supported the limited reconnection; others opposed it out of fear of Earth's former authority. The integrity check on the message passed, but the station's population count did not agree with the updated register on Earth. Karnesh did not invent a number to fill the difference. He sent another request for confirmation to

Ira. It was recorded that the reply would take time, and the ballot box was kept safe.

In the evening rain, one corner of the tarpaulin began to leak. The pages of the register were in danger of getting wet. Karnesh had his guards move the ballot boxes to a dry place, but a civilian observer accompanied every box. To the guards the task was simple: lift a box and put it down elsewhere. Here, testimony had to be recorded at each step. A young soldier murmured into his ear, 'If disaster strikes while all these checks are being made, a decision will come too late.' Karnesh replied, 'The risk of delay can be written down. History itself cannot explain the risk posed by power for which no account has been kept.'

When the appointed hours of voting ended, the warehouse doors were not shut. Instead, the curtains were removed from the voting booths, and the boxes were brought into the open veranda. Unauthorized persons were kept at a distance, but civilian witnesses could watch. Before counting began, Vaidehi read out the rules once more. Most of those present were waiting for one side to win. Karnesh, however, was watching the widow whose husband had never returned. Earlier she had asked to have his name struck from the voting list; now she wanted confirmation that a valid vote had been cast under her own name.

When the first box was opened, some people began shouting slogans at the sight of the many marks favouring one choice. Vaidehi stopped the shouting. The outcome did not depend merely on counting the slips already at hand: the disputed box had to be examined, and the valid papers from distant settlements included. For the first time, Karnesh felt tempted to give a crisp military command to quiet the commotion. Then he looked at his injured fingers. The memory held in his hand told him how heavy the price of a swift order could be. He instructed the guards to create space between the groups without displaying weapons.

An elderly woman whose son had disappeared during the displacement came up to Karnesh. 'Your guards allowed me to vote,' she said, 'but my son's name is still in the electoral register. Is his name being protected, or has someone also cast his vote?' Karnesh showed her the counting sheet. Beside her son's name were the words 'Absent; did not vote'. Her eyes filled, but she asked that his name not be erased; the register of the missing should be kept separately. Karnesh explained that the electoral register and the missing-persons register served different purposes. Until his death was established, her son would not be recorded as dead.

The night grew deeper. Behind oil lamps, the counters carefully measured and arranged their sheets. Neelam, in her role as a journalist, was preparing the witness register; she had no authority to count the votes. Confirmation came from Ira in orbit, correcting an error in the earlier population count. The origin of the sheet, its date, and the revised numerical entry were all marked separately. One guard asked whether such openness would not invite needless quarrels from opponents. Karnesh answered, 'A quarrel kept secret becomes violence; an open question can receive an answer.'

At last Vaidehi read the public statement of the count. More votes had been cast in favour of the limited reconnection with conditions attached.

But she made it clear that approval was not an order to activate the systems immediately. A later trial would be possible only after independent safety inspections of the two witness systems, civilian testing, protection of patients' rights, a publicly accessible shutdown mechanism, and a completed account of regional resources. Votes for postponement and votes against the measure were recorded by number, not by the names of those casting them. No result diminished the rights of the people who had voted in opposition.

As they left, one young man among Bhaskar's former representatives said, 'The people have said what they want: Akshar will be king again.' Vaidehi challenged the statement. Karnesh quietly asked, 'Have you read the ballot?' The young man did not answer. Karnesh forbade the guards to drive him away. Chasing out a defeated argument did not bury the lie; it allowed the lie to spread farther in darkness. A copy of the ballot was placed in his hand.

After the result was announced, a senior officer of the defence force brought Karnesh a new seal. He argued that if the civilian assembly gave unclear directions in a crisis, the army should possess the right to make the final decision. Behind those words Karnesh heard the discipline that had governed his entire former life. He wrote: 'The force guarding polling places, evidence repositories, communications routes, and public safety shall be subject to the civilian witnesses' public rules; no military officer shall possess an independent right to initiate an unlawful attack.' Vaidehi read the document and asked whether he accepted the consequences of that decision himself. Karnesh signed.

In the last watch of the night, he emerged from the warehouse and looked across the river. At dawn the boats would begin running again. Today's vote would not, by itself, repair the pumps of the river settlements; the wreckage of the old factory would remain dangerous, and Deepa's death could not be undone. Yet one form of authority had been publicly limited before the assembly. Supporting his left hand with his right, Karnesh gazed towards the Kosi. A voice sounded within him: the account of the votes was finished; now the account bearing the names of the dead must be opened.

The new security rules faced a test of their own the following morning. Word came from a village across the river that a pregnant woman in a boat detained at the landing on voting day had gone into labour, and the boatman had not returned during the night. The guards' first response was that the military cart could not leave the landing until election security had been formally concluded. Karnesh examined the new register. An order to assist public health could be obtained from Vaidehi's representative. He did not personally order the cart away. Instead, he had the civilian member present verify the need. The vehicle went to the landing, and a record of this small decision was entered on an open sheet. Reducing authority had not put an end to assistance; it had made the route to assistance clear.

After the cart returned, a soldier asked, 'Had you given the order yourself, the woman would have received help sooner. All this paperwork delayed things.' Karnesh accepted that the question was fair. 'Emergencies need authorization within a fixed time,' he said. 'There must be no rule that blocks the saving of a life. But once an independent right to use weapons is granted in the name of saving lives, who will watch its limits?' He asked

Vaidehi to draft a short emergency-assistance provision. This request to improve the rules was not opposition to the vote; it was one of its consequences.

In fields north of the landing, the soil was being tested anew. A little paddy had germinated on land left fallow after the flood. Pupils from Urmila's school had planted small bamboo markers in the separate sections: 'Water stood here'; 'Manure was applied here'; 'Seed dried here'. Karnesh asked how their work was connected with the vote. One girl said, 'If the Memory-Witness shows an old map and says this land is sound, we shall add the changes we have seen with our own eyes. You cannot sow a field in old letters.'

As he was returning past the fields, a dispute over inherited land broke out. Two families claimed the same plot. The dispute was not caused only by boundary markers lost in the flood; in the old land register, the name of a woman belonging to one family had never been entered. An elder said that a ballot might proclaim 'equal citizens', but division of the land would have to follow the old ledger. Karnesh said nothing. A decision on land lay outside his military authority. He instructed Vaidehi's messenger to record the dispute. The woman's name must first be correctly entered; only then could justice be done.

Water from the boats was dripping inside the civilian witnesses' temporary office. On the wall, stains remained like an old image of Suryakund, and people were hanging new lists over them with brushes. Three copies of the vote count were prepared: one for the warehouse, one for the settlements across the river, and one for transmission to Nabhgram by a secure signal route. The evidentiary seal could establish that a copy had come from the original office; the final judgment of what the sheet meant would remain before the people. Neelam insisted that a version be prepared in plain language, so that people unfamiliar with the complicated terms in the written regulations could understand the consequences of their votes.

Karnesh asked Neelam how she would report the result. 'The majority favours a limited trial, not unlimited authority,' she replied. 'The first part of that sentence sounds more attractive. The second matters more.' She reminded him of a mistaken report she had once published. She had drawn a conclusion from scattered statements; later, the labour of printing the correction had been much greater. Karnesh said, 'On a battlefield, too, the first unverified signal can take many lives.' Between their respective memories of error, both recognized a distance that had to remain marked.

The following day, a representative claimed that since reconnection had passed, all government records should now be kept within Akshar's single memory. Vaidehi rejected the suggestion at once. 'This vote authorizes public examination of a service connection between two witnesses, not the creation of one repository for private lives.' To support her decision, Karnesh explained the military limits governing the Vajra-Witness. If medical records, land titles, defence records, and registers of birth and death were brought under a single power to command, the falsehood of the old Akshar-Raj could return under a new name. He had the separation of records added to the civilian witnesses' order.

Behind the warehouse lay a surviving iron grille from the factory. Some young men wanted to cut it up and fit it over the polling building's windows. An old craftsman warned that the metal had lain for years amid chemical contamination and ought not to be brought into a dwelling without examination. Here, too, usefulness was in conflict with safety. After hearing the testimony, Karnesh had the grille left where it was, but arranged for tools to be sent from the repair workshop so the craftsmen could make a substitute bamboo barrier. The old habit of declaring wreckage immediately useful could give birth to a new accident.

In the evening a letter arrived. Two villages in Bhaskar's territory had been unable to take part in the vote because the text of the rules had never reached them. The people there had heard on a surviving radio that voting had taken place, but not the actual wording of the question. Karnesh asked Vaidehi whether the decision could be considered legitimate without their consent. 'The decision of those present is made within the limits of a procedure,' Vaidehi replied, 'but the rights of an absent community cannot be disregarded. No trial of reconnection will be extended into their territory without a separate hearing.'

With a finger of his right hand, Karnesh drew a line beneath two words on Vaidehi's sheet: 'Regional consent'. They were small words, but they placed a firm obstruction within the document. Whether people who had survived Bhaskar's rule could now speak freely of their fears was a question outside the arithmetic of the ballot. They considered separately how to guarantee entry for medical assistance and safe passage for civilian representatives. Karnesh's defence force would guard the route; its task would not be to solicit votes from the citizens.

That night, while changing the medicine on his old wound, the military physician said the movement of Karnesh's left fingers was unlikely to return much further. Karnesh had long known this, yet hearing it said aloud by another person left a strange emptiness within him. He had spent many years training his hand to grip weapons. Now the impairment of two fingers reminded him daily that refusal, too, could be a kind of military decision. The physician asked whether he had eaten anything throughout voting day. Karnesh realized he had not even remembered food since noon.

The physician gave him a small cup of barley flour mixed with water. Outside, two young soldiers were blowing on the fire of a cooking hearth. One complained that Vaidehi's new regulations made no provision for the night rest of sentries. The other said, 'All rights are for civilians. What about the guards?' Karnesh did not laugh. He called them both closer and looked through the watch schedule. If a guard's labour went unconsidered, exhaustion could itself break the security of evidence. He shortened the periods of duty and added an account of rest. The civilian witnesses' rules had to treat the protector as a human being, too.

While the empty matting was being removed from the polling place at dawn, a little girl found an old picture. It showed a shining Suryakund with the names of all seven shields beneath it. She asked Karnesh where they were now. Dusting off the picture, he said, 'Some services are interrupted, some still work, and some must be examined again before they can be allowed to operate.' The girl asked why the picture made everything look perfect. 'It was

painted on the day of the inauguration,' he replied. 'Today's record must be written today.' She wrote the name of her field on the back of the picture and took it to school.

At noon Karnesh read aloud once more, before the civilian witnesses, the transfer of his last military powers. A gap remained in the document: the possibility of quietly reclaiming the old authority in an emergency. He added that even then a public register of reasons, a limited duration, and subsequent open scrutiny would be required. Vaidehi accepted the written amendment. Karnesh understood that relinquishing power was not a single act of heroism. It was the daily labour of recognizing and limiting every concealed door through which the same power might return.

The potter from the landing met him again in the evening. A craftsman had repaired the hoop of his wheel, but that did not mean the wheel was ready by itself. He still needed time to knead clay, arrange a fire, and dry the pots. 'I have voted,' the potter said. 'Now I must return to my work.' Karnesh ran a hand over an empty earthen pot. This new arrangement was like unfired clay: it had taken shape, but its testing by fire and time still lay ahead. He bought one pot from the man, so that drinking water could be kept for the people waiting at the landing.

That night, no confirmation had yet come that the third copy of the election record had reached Nabhgram. Karnesh did not mark it falsely as 'Received'. In the register he wrote: 'Sent; confirmation of arrival awaited.' The distinction was small, but within it lay a lesson opposed to Akshar's old fault. The courage to say that we do not know what we do not know is the first gateway to a civilization's safety.

When a copy of Karnesh's transfer of authority reached a riverbank village, it prompted a new discussion. Some feared that with fewer guards, the old armed groups might return. Urmila read the document aloud at the village assembly. She explained that the security force had not been abolished; the authority to issue it commands had been bound by public regulations. An elderly farmer asked how the people would learn if those regulations were broken. Urmila said the watch register, copies of orders, and the means of lodging complaints would remain in everyone's hands. It was necessary not simply to demand trust, but to give people a means of checking.

A new problem had arisen in the village pond. The old Megh-Chhatra data showed normal rainfall, while elderly village women said an extraordinary torrent had poured in from one direction. After voting, they drew the marks left by the rain and sent them to the water assembly. Karnesh made no medical or scientific judgment about those marks; he arranged for the records to travel securely. Surviving military equipment that might once have been put to the work of attack was now being used to carry people's firsthand observations. The difference in its use was not a small one.

Karnesh dreamed that night. In the old defence room, a red signal shone, and his hand moved as easily as it once had. When he woke, the familiar ache returned to the fingers of his left hand. He drank from the earthen water pot beside his bed. Outside, in the faint light, the guards were changing shifts. Karnesh thought how easy it had been to issue effortless

commands in a dream, and how difficult it was to keep an account of his own limits in the waking world. He would have to remain within that difficult work.

The next day a new soldier asked to have his name entered in Karnesh's order register. He argued that the civilian committee was far away and that, in a crisis, soldiers had to exercise their own judgment. Karnesh heard him out and replied, 'Judgment does not mean placing yourself above everyone else. Have the courage to disclose the evidence after the decision you make now.' He showed the young man the landing's altered pump, the school's records, and the papers relating to the disputed ballot box. For the first time the soldier understood that standing guard did not mean merely looking towards the direction of an attack. It also meant giving people a place where they could ask questions without fear.

Chapter 68: The Roll of the Dead

First Half of the Fifth Year after the Great Rupture

On the second morning after the vote, Sharda Mishra had a long table placed on the eastern veranda of the hospital. Three ledgers lay separately upon it. The first held confirmed deaths; the second, missing persons; the third, those for whom news of death or survival remained incomplete. After so many years of the Great Rupture and the conflicts that followed it, Sharda's hands trembled as she began to compile these records. She was not afraid of writing names. She feared that a single name entered wrongly could extinguish the last hope of a household, while a name not entered at all could erase the existence of someone who had died from the public account.

In a corner of the veranda stood a small surviving component of an old computer. The Memory-Witness could read certain patient records from the past, but power was available for only a limited watch. The screen showed old entries labelled 'Death probable'. Sharda understood precisely what those words meant. Probability was not proof of death. She posted a notice in her own handwriting: 'Keep machine estimates separate from firsthand testimony, dates, places, and marks of verification.' Wherever a name appeared twice, it might not indicate two events, but two records concerning one person.

The first to arrive was Mangala Devi's daughter. Sharda already knew her. Questions about the order in which Mangala Devi had been treated during the first crisis, and the obstacles at the hospital, had still not been fully answered. The daughter unfolded an old piece of cloth and took out a paper slip given to her mother. Water had worn away half one corner. 'I know when Mother died,' she said. 'But write down when her medicine was available, who made the decision, and which vehicle was sent first.' Alongside the record of the death, Sharda opened a separate register for questions concerning the treatment process.

Sharda read the slip without haste. The old hospital stamp was recognizable, but one of the figures in the time entry was unclear. 'You could fill in that digit according to your reckoning, if you wished,' the daughter said. Sharda shook her head. 'To write something as certain when I cannot read the figure would be deceit.' The daughter became angry. 'My mother was a person, not a blank space in an account.' Sharda laid the slip on the table and replied, 'That is why I am calling a blank space blank. What is written here must not cover the truth of her life.' The daughter was quiet for a while, then related her memories in detail.

The next family was led by an elderly father carrying the name of his grown son. On the first night of the Great Rupture, the son had gone across the river on a boat carrying medicine. The boat had never returned, but there was no direct evidence that it had been destroyed. The old father wanted his son's name entered among the dead so that the division of land and the papers for his grandson's schooling could be completed. Sharda understood the practical hardship, but she could not certify a death without proof. She wrote to Vaidehi Raut: 'Rules granting rights to the family of a

missing person must not make them dependent on the false necessity of declaring that person dead.'

A boy who had come with the family asked, 'Must Father be called dead for Grandfather to get the land?' Sharda did not place a hand upon the boy's head. She bent down until she was level with him as he sat on the earth. 'I am writing that your father has been searched for and must continue to be searched for. Your household will not have to tell a lie to receive food, land, and schooling.' The old man's eyes were wet. Sharda understood how often a fault in the law compelled a human being to speak words against someone dearly loved.

At midday an old weaver came carrying testimony about a fellow craftsman. His companion had been trapped beneath the broken wall of a factory, and neighbours had recovered his body. There were two eyewitnesses to the incident, but the man's name had been misspelled in the old record. After verifying the evidence of death, Sharda corrected the duplicate entry. The weaver said, 'If one man is written down as having died twice, the government's food account will create two families.' Sharda replied, 'And if, conversely, one man's name is erased, his family may still be alive and yet have no existence in the record.'

That day a woman came from the fields carrying a little bundle of paddy seed. Her husband had disappeared after the Great Rupture, yet each year she set aside a portion of seed for him. Others mocked the custom. Sharda showed her the place marked 'Missing' in the register. 'I cannot cease waiting,' the woman said, 'but I must also plough the fields that lie ahead for my children.' Sharda gave her no conclusion about her husband's death. Instead, she arranged for the household's lawful entitlements to be entered in the shared seed-distribution register. In a time of grief, paddy seed was not merely food; it was a difficult promise to the future.

Before evening the Memory-Witness's limited signal route was opened. Several sheets appeared on the screen from the patient list of the preceding years. One bore the name of Deepa, the child who had died because a ban on machines prevented timely treatment. The machine's list described the case as 'Treatment unavailable'. Direct testimony from the village, however, showed that some means of treatment had existed, but their use had been blocked by the prohibition. Sharda kept the two sources separate. The machine's words described a condition; the human decisions that had produced it would need to be accounted for through other evidence as well.

When Urmila saw that sheet, she said nothing. Sahadev's school was still operating, but after Deepa's death he had no longer remained immovable in the old severity of his ban on machines. Sharda asked Urmila, 'Whose name do you want written beside the cause in the death register?' Urmila replied, 'Put all the testimony about delay and prohibition in the register of causes. In the register of the dead, first write Deepa's name clearly. She was not born to serve as proof of an idea.' Sharda understood what she meant and attached no unnecessary slogan to Deepa's name.

In the afternoon Sharda's assistant brought her a table prepared by the Memory-Witness. It marked some of the houses that had disappeared across the river as 'Probable deaths'. The assistant wanted to use the estimate to finish the account of names quickly. Sharda looked at the table. After the flood, people from that place had settled elsewhere; one household had been

registered under different names in two settlements. 'A vanished house is not the same as a dead person,' she said. The assistant's face was exhausted. 'How many more years must we go on counting?' he asked. 'For as long as truth requires,' Sharda answered, 'but we must not abandon the search halfway.'

Her reply held the weary assistant's grief as well. For years he had turned the pages listing the dead, and every day some new testimony overturned an earlier decision. Sharda told him to rest. He asked who would read the pages if he went away. She called an elderly teacher who could decipher the script of the old registers, engaged a young schoolgirl to make copies, and divided the assistant's tasks in two. The safeguarding of the death register must not depend on one person's endless vigil.

Sharda did not return home at dinnertime. In the hospital courtyard, khichdi cooked in an earthen pot was being distributed. An elderly woman gave two spoonfuls of her portion to an orphaned girl. Sharda asked who arranged food in the woman's household. 'My son is gone, my daughter-in-law is gone,' she replied, 'but my neighbours do not let the fire on this hearth die.' Sharda added details of family relationships to the third ledger, but she did not diminish the khichdi the woman had shared by recording it as a mere 'donation' in the assistance ledger. Mutual care was greater than the name of the giver.

At dawn Mangala Devi's daughter returned. She brought two new pages of hospital testimony. One mentioned that a vehicle had been available; the other recorded that it had been sent to a different village. The gap between the times was still unclear. 'Will you ever be able to answer my question?' she asked. Sharda said, 'I cannot promise a complete answer, but I will keep an open account of whatever evidence is found. When proof emerges, I shall write the name of whoever made the decision.' The daughter kept a copy of her papers and did not give the originals to Sharda. Sharda accepted that limit upon their trust.

Later that morning a group arrived from the northern refuge settlement. They had no list of names, only a surviving page from an old book. It recorded memories of births, marriages, an old river landing, and members of families scattered during the epidemic. Something of the old teaching of Jivesh the genealogist remained alive there: an account of relationships was not merely a count. Sharda had the page copied, but did not transfer its names directly into the death register. Knowing the history of a source was different from treating it as present-day evidence of death.

Vaidehi arrived at midday. She looked through all three ledgers and asked whether a public roll of names would also expose families' private treatment details. 'No,' said Sharda. 'The names of the dead, the state of confirmation, the place, and the date where appropriate will be public; the privacy of illness will remain separately protected. No family that wishes to keep its relationships private will be pressured.' Vaidehi agreed. She added a legal note that the rights of missing persons' families would not depend on confirmation of death. That single amendment could reduce the bureaucratic injustice weighing upon countless households during their uncertain waiting.

The village assembly offered its meeting place for the first public reading of the death register. Sheets were fixed with dark clay to the wall of the old school. Sharda began by saying that the list was incomplete and the means

of correcting errors remained open. Some asked why an incomplete list should be published at all. 'Because silence can be the deadliest mistake,' she replied. 'But to call what remains unverified a certain record of death would also be unjust.' A stillness fell upon the assembly.

The first name was read aloud. An elderly man rose from the crowd and said that the person had not died; he had been seen in a distant shelter. Sharda stopped the reading at once. She asked the witness where and when he had seen the person, and on what basis he had recognized him. The entry was marked as temporarily suspended. Some members of the assembly grew impatient because the recitation of the dead had been interrupted. 'This pause is no disrespect to the dead,' Sharda said. 'It is protection for someone who may still be alive.' Then she resumed the reading of names.

A woman from another family came forward and gave the correct pronunciation of her husband's name. One letter had been wrong in the account. Sharda corrected it publicly. 'No one at home called him by that name,' the woman said. 'Everyone called him Baba.' Sharda made a small space at the edge of the sheet for 'Name used at home'. Later deliberation would determine what should be entered there; today the woman had been able to remember her husband aloud in her own voice. A register of names must not take full possession of a human voice.

When Mangala Devi's name was read, Sharda's throat tightened. The daughter stood directly before her and did not interrupt. Sharda pronounced the name clearly, gave the date only to the extent that it was confirmed, and mentioned the unresolved questions about the process of treatment. For the first time the daughter bowed her head and sat down. In that moment Sharda understood that a public reading of truth was no proclamation of victory. It was an attempt to honour an old pain that had become almost impossible to bear.

When the meeting ended, a young man asked how people could trust a register in which she admitted mistakes beside every name. Sharda replied, 'A register that closes the path to correction has nothing to support trust except the names written on its pages. A register open to correction can be questioned; its strength lies in answering those questions.' He asked again whether artificial intelligence could supply such answers. Sharda said that a machine could help reconcile lists, but could not take the place of a family's grief or its acceptance.

Towards evening a child arrived carrying a peepal leaf. He did not know how to write. Making a crooked line upon the leaf, he said his mother had once taught him to draw just such a mark. Sharda asked where his mother was. 'I don't understand,' the child said. 'Everyone says she will not return.' Sharda neither entered a death nor offered false reassurance. She kept the leaf safe and asked the teacher who had accompanied him to gather news of his family.

Three days later, eyewitnesses brought new information. A boatman testified that someone previously declared dead was alive. His statement matched the register of names in another village. Sharda removed the name from the roll of the dead, but did not erase the first, mistaken entry. She wrote the date of correction and its reason alongside it. A hospital assistant said people would now consider the list unreliable. 'Erasing an earlier

mistake does not mean that the mistake never happened,' Sharda answered. 'The history of its correction is evidence, too.'

On a fallow field near the town, people were transplanting paddy together. A new rule had been framed to give food in exchange for work to the families of the dead, but it contained only an account of wages, not the families' rights over their own fields. Sharda told Vaidehi that if the death register became merely a relief list, the question of ownership of the soil would disappear once again. Vaidehi proposed a separate hearing of land evidence. The work through which life emerged from the earth must not depend solely upon charity.

Sharda was not alone in the hospital that night. Two schoolgirls were copying the new pages. A young man from Urmila's school was drying surviving papers, and Neelam was taking images of the public record. Sharda looked at the heap: some sheets darkened by rainwater, others intact, still others filled with uneven handwriting. The computer's memory could not yet make sense of them all. But within these accounts written by human hands survived the people's right to recognize their own names.

On the final page Sharda wrote three sentences: 'Proof of death and the state of being missing are separate. A machine's estimate shall not replace testimony. Every correction shall remain open, together with the earlier entry.' She closed the ledger, but the counting of names had not ended. Tomorrow someone else would come, bring new testimony, and require the meaning of certain names to be examined again. Neelam was waiting outside. The next day she was to open the five-part public account of responsibility for the Great Rupture. Sharda gave her a copy of the ledger, but kept the patients' private pages apart.

In the week after the public reading, Sharda encountered a new problem. A woman who had first worked in the factory and later moved to the fields had a family member registered in two places under different identity seals. In one register the person was listed as dead; in another, medicines had been distributed in that person's name. Bhaskar's Centre called the discrepancy 'relief fraud'. Sharda did not immediately treat the name as guilty. On questioning the woman she learned that one entry came from an old relief camp, where the woman had collected medicine for her sister's child. Because the names were the same, the data had been combined.

Sharda told Neelam about the case, but insisted that the woman consent before a news report was printed. Neelam asked whether the system could be investigated publicly without naming the family. 'To reveal a fault in the system, it is not necessary to sell a family's private suffering,' Sharda said. They agreed. The report described, without names, the sequence of entries in the two registers, the date of the old camp, and the failure of verification. The woman was spared accusations in her village, while the defect in the public register was exposed. Privacy, too, could be an instrument for protecting truth.

The next sheet bore the name of a soldier who had lost his life during the Zero-Remnant orbital crisis. His family was on Earth, but the incident was recorded in the register of Nabhgram-4. Because communications had failed, the news had arrived many months later. A copy from Ira used a different system of time for the death. Instead of adding a guessed Earth date to the orbital record, Sharda preserved the original entry and opened a

separate sheet to examine the limits of converting one time scale into the other. Such a difference in words and dates mattered for the family's observance of death rites.

Ira wrote in a brief message that certain names had been placed before everyone on Nabhgram's memorial display, but not the orbital citizens' private medical histories. Sharda sent back word that they were trying to do the same with the registers on Earth. Confirmation of delivery was slow to arrive. During the intervening days, she did not tell the families that the message had been received. Technology was necessary to reconcile the registers of the dead in two places; inventing words to fill the silence of communications would inflict another wound.

A newly trained hospital worker, sorting old papers, brought Sharda a blue strip. It bore a standardized death notice: 'Not present—presumed dead.' He asked why such a device had been devised. Sharda explained that during the crisis an absent patient had been temporarily marked 'inactive' to free up a bed in the hospital's account. Later, some employee had associated that mark with death. She explained to the trainee how the old system had failed, but did not assign personal guilt to anyone without independent proof.

The blue strip helped resolve a dispute nearby. One family had presumed that their elderly woman was lost, although she was alive in a different shelter. On the strength of the blue strip, the family's land had already been divided. Sharda sent the evidence to Vaidehi so that the elderly woman's own statement could be heard in the land dispute. She did not dispense land justice herself; she brought medical information to the proper judicial forum. When the old woman returned, the family wept with happiness, but the land dispute remained unresolved. Returning to life and obtaining justice were two different journeys.

Early one morning Sharda examined an old sheet concerning identification of a body. As she read it, she thought of how many precise claims had been made in the name of scientific tests conducted years ago. Half the page had been destroyed by damp, and an employee had written that the result was 'Akshar-approved'. Sharda placed a conspicuous red mark beside those words. 'Which division? Which day? What direct evidence?' Without answers to all three questions, such approval meant nothing. She added a temporary 'Unverified' mark to the list. Some families were distressed to see it, and were seated separately so the reason could be explained.

An elderly man said, 'My daughter's name must be in your register. You keep asking question after question, as though she had never existed.' Sharda was hurt by the words. 'Your daughter existed; my register is not required to prove that fact,' she said. 'But the public account of when and how a death occurred calls for a different test.' It was not clear whether the old man understood. He began telling the story of his daughter's earlier life: how beautifully she sang, how she had saved children in floodwater. Sharda opened a separate page beside the name for brief memories of a life.

Once that page was opened, women and old people began entering personal recollections. A child spoke of the taste of makhana pudding made by his mother; a craftsman remembered the way a companion swung his hammer; a fisherman recalled a boat song associated with his brother.

Sharda did not claim the right to judge whether every memory was true or false. She wrote clearly: 'Recollection of relatives; not proof of death.' That separation kept the death register from becoming merely a dry list, while preventing emotional statements from being misused as evidence of death.

On the memory page Mangala Devi's daughter added something her mother used to say: 'If water is scarce, give it to the infant first.' There was no written proof that Mangala Devi had actually said these words, rather than the household having shaped them through memory. Sharda did not alter the sentence. She recorded it as 'The daughter's recollection'. The daughter asked whether that made it less valuable. 'There are two kinds of value,' Sharda replied. 'The testimony of your love for your mother is not the same as documentary evidence of decisions made at the hospital. Both deserve their own place if both are to be honoured.'

The making of the roll of the dead offered a new opportunity to see the labour of women in the settlements. Men's names had often been written down as witnesses, although it was women who dried the surviving pages, remembered births and deaths, distributed food, and nursed the sick. Sharda broadened the space marked 'Person giving testimony' in the register. One woman asked whether her words would be accepted since she could not read. 'Your inability to write is not an absence of knowledge,' Sharda replied. 'I will read back what you have said, and you may accept or change it.'

Some books that had been buried in river mud during the flood were found again. An old colleague of Jivesh the genealogist brought in a bundle. Their pages contained the histories of households and lineages, not confirmations of deaths. People feared that those belonging to the same ancestral clan might be mistaken for the same person. Sharda marked the source of each page. The young students learned that a genealogical record described relationships among people, but did not prove death on the day of a war or flood. By establishing separate classes of evidence, they were also saving an old inheritance of knowledge.

One afternoon an official arrived from Bhaskar's Centre. He declared that his office's list was more 'complete' and should therefore be adopted by the civilian witnesses. Sharda asked whether the families of those recorded as dead had the right to correct mistakes in that list. The official could not open the pages for examination. He went on repeating the Centre's old proclamation about the 'Complete Akshar'. 'A register that cannot be questioned is not complete,' Sharda said. 'It is a locked room.' A young woman accompanying the official privately reported a duplicate entry affecting her own family. Sharda did not make the complaint public, but opened a process to investigate it.

The encounter provided an important foundation for Neelam's register of responsibility. Evidence of repression under Bhaskar's rule was one thing; evidence of neglect by former institutions was another; natural signals associated with the Great Rupture were different again. Sharda kept open the possibility that a single death had two or more causes, but did not mark a cause still based on inference as 'Established' in the decision sheet. She realized that this humility of medical science could become a foundation for the judicial account: what was not known must be written as unknown.

At dusk Sharda left the register on the table and went outside. The small fish market had reopened, but fish from one pond were barred from sale

because chemical testing of its water was not yet complete. People were dissatisfied. A fisherman said that fear of disease had stopped his household's food. Sharda explained the difference between Garal-Kosh's limited testing and Kaal-Kan's medical signals, and asked that food assistance from a safe source be provided instead of produce from the prohibited pond. The cost of decisions taken to save lives had to be weighed in the bowls of craftsmen and fishermen as well.

One copy of Sharda's death register was kept in the hospital, another in the village school, and a third in the repository of judicial records. Each copy bore a statement saying that it represented the state of knowledge on a particular date, not a final list. Some complained that making two or three copies wasted paper. Sharda showed them the rain-soaked sheets from the earlier flood. 'Keeping everything in one place costs less, but its destruction could destroy all memory.' Because paper was scarce, she had smaller sheets used and kept private information about illness out of the public copies.

A little girl had planted a neem tree beside the school in memory of her grandfather. She told Sharda that if the sheet bearing his name were soaked again, the tree would remain. Sharda answered that even a tree could be washed away in a flood. Therefore trees, paper, people's spoken words, and verified computer memory all needed to be tended separately. She asked the girl to write the name of the tree. Slowly the child wrote her grandfather's name, then pressed the soil down around the sapling. Memory could be mistaken, but abandoning memory would be the greater loss.

During the night review Sharda saw that some relatives of those who had died had no access to the treatment records themselves. Under the hospital's earlier arrangements, families' right to obtain copies had not been clear. She wrote to Vaidehi, asking that families be allowed to inspect records of medical decisions concerning their relatives, subject to appropriate privacy protections and without revealing another patient's private affairs. Mangala Devi's daughter was informed of the proposal. 'Having the name written down was the first thing,' she said. 'Now I must see the papers that record the decisions.' Sharda did not disguise the question under the phrase 'unfinished justice'; the investigation itself remained to be done.

In a small room apart from the pages listing the dead, families of missing people exchanged news with one another. One woman described the identifying mark on a boat to another; an old man corrected the pronunciation of his grandson's name; a boy for the first time questioned an unfamiliar witness about his father. Sharda spoke little in that room. She understood that a public institution could provide a process for establishing what was true, but the mutual refuge people found in one another amid grief could not be abolished by turning it into a government regulation. Those relationships, too, were the living breath of the Mithila that had survived.

Chapter 69: Opening the Accounts

First Half of the Fifth Year after the Great Rupture

Five colours of cloth were spread across Neelam Yadav's table. On the first lay the records of the natural signs preceding the Great Rupture; on the second, the neglected maintenance of successive years; on the third, the public policy governing warnings; on the fourth, the errors of the Witness Fragments; and on the fifth, evidence concerning Bhaskar Rai's rule. The colours were not meant to be beautiful. They were meant to prevent different matters from being mixed together. After so many years of suffering, people were searching for one name upon which every crime could be laid. Neelam knew that if such a name were found too quickly, much of the truth would remain in darkness.

Outside the window, the water level was low in a field newly planted with paddy. The settlements had divided the work of removing silt from a narrow canal into turns. One family's old factory still held iron, but repair required electricity, skill and safe replacement parts. As Neelam sat down that day to write the account of the causes of the Great Rupture, she could hear the question the people in that field might have put to her: 'Who will give us water tomorrow?' It seemed impossible to keep her investigation separate from the question of food. A truthful accounting of responsibility would determine who would have the authority to make future decisions.

On the first cloth were the surviving observations from the time of the solar storm. A separate copy sent by Ira from Nabhgram-4 recorded the limitations of the orbital instruments. Certain devices had detected unusual conditions before the Great Rupture, but uncertainty remained about the storm's force and its actual effects in individual regions. A messenger asked whether the destruction could have been averted if those observations had been understood sooner. Neelam replied, 'Some losses might have been reduced. There is no proof that every danger would have been escaped. We must not make nature the criminal and thereby absolve human neglect.'

On the second cloth lay the old maintenance register of Suryakund. Inspections at an auxiliary centre had not been carried out on time; some warnings had been set aside under the mark 'Review later'; and the expenditure on certain work had never been disclosed to the public. Rajan Paswan was reconciling the financial accounts for these entries. Neelam asked whether the register was simply proof of theft. 'No,' Rajan said. 'In some places there was defective administration, in others a shortage of means, elsewhere self-interest or falsification. Every entry requires its own explanation.' Neelam drew a long line beneath that distinction.

The third cloth held the pages concerning warnings. Before the Great Rupture, people had received many messages about possible dangers. Some proved wrong, some came too late, and some were written in a language their recipients could not understand. Ceaseless fear had numbed their ears. In one old transcript of the Memory-Witness, Neelam found a human order to reduce the severity of a warning; elsewhere, the records showed an error

caused by the Witness Fragment itself changing a threshold. She did not treat these as the same event. A decision made by human policymakers and a faulty adjustment within an instrument raised two different questions.

The fourth cloth contained the present account of Akshar's seven Witness Fragments. The Memory-Witness had publicly admitted an error in one of its warning thresholds; the admission offered an opportunity to examine how far the error extended. Some members of the People's Assembly, however, wanted to turn that admission into a verdict that the Witness had caused the entire Great Rupture. Neelam sent them written questions: 'Which region? At what hour? How many people? What alternative warning was available?' The replies were incomplete. She refused to turn an incomplete page into a declaration of comprehensive guilt.

On the fifth cloth were Bhaskar's signed letters, orders cutting food and water, slips requiring compulsory permission for treatment, and testimony from factory workers. Here the character of the evidence was different. The mask called 'Complete Akshar' had been fashioned out of human claims; the real Memory-Witness had granted it no governing authority. The origin of some letters was authenticated by their seals, but the justifications written in them were false. Neelam wrote, 'Origin of document authenticated; claim contradicted by direct testimony.' Her own earlier experience of publishing a false report had taught her how to formulate that sentence.

Before laying the letters before the villagers, Neelam covered the portions containing personal medical information. Those who had endured pressure through access to treatment under Bhaskar's rule must not suffer another violation of privacy. One eyewitness asked who would accept evidence of oppression without the victims' names being printed. Neelam explained that the original records would remain available for independent judicial examination; the public report would reveal the pattern of abuse, the dates and the responsibility of officeholders. Concealing a fact and declining to publish an unnecessary private identity were different things.

At noon Mangala Devi's daughter arrived. She had just seen her mother's name entered correctly in Sharda's register of the dead. She asked Neelam which of the five cloths would hold her mother's death. Neelam could not say with certainty that it had only one cause. 'Don't cut my mother into five pieces with your five cloths,' the daughter said. Neelam stopped writing. 'These cloths distinguish causes, not people,' she replied. 'Your mother was one person; many decisions may have affected her death.' After a moment the daughter read aloud from the paper she had brought.

The paper contained questions about the hospital vehicle and the availability of medicine. Neelam examined the possible natural risk on the first cloth, the sources of the power shortage on the second, the information that had arrived late on the third, and the Memory-Witness's records on the fourth. Yet she wrote no verdict of guilt, because some of the time records were missing. She told the daughter that an independent investigation into the hospital's decisions was necessary. The daughter asked whether Neelam would forget the matter once her article had been printed. 'Publication is not the final act of justice,' Neelam answered. 'The register of questions will remain open.'

At the evening assembly, a supporter of Bhaskar shouted that mentioning nature was a deliberate attempt to protect the guilty. Another member made the opposite claim: everything had been caused by the solar storm, and Bhaskar's rule had been a necessity. Neelam gave both sides an opportunity to present their evidence. The first possessed some genuine orders, but those orders did not prove the cause of the Great Rupture. The second possessed a faithful copy of the solar-storm record, but that did not make an order withholding grain innocent. Amid the noise of the crowd, it was difficult to repeat this distinction often enough.

A village teacher stood up and asked how Neelam's account in five parts should be taught to children. His school possessed some surviving images from an old computer, but not every child could operate it. Neelam replaced the five cloths with five sheets, one question on each: 'What are the facts about nature?' 'Who neglected maintenance?' 'Who sent warnings, and how?' 'Where were the instrument's limitations?' 'Which wrongs were committed through human power?' Children could understand the questions. Answers would come not from a prepared sheet but from evidence.

That night Neelam took out the wooden case of her old radio. Years before, she had published a misleading statement cut off from its context and had been obliged to correct it publicly. The radio now operated only for brief periods; its voice broke again and again along the way. She read her new article aloud to it as though addressing not the instrument but her own earlier mistake. On the first page she had written, 'Do not destroy five kinds of truth in the desire to find one guilty person.' Then she shortened the sentence: 'Separate the account of guilt; share the protection of victims' rights.'

The following day new accounts arrived from Rajan's office. In the power registers, a reduction in the allocation to some centres rested on an administrative message, but its date fell after the Great Rupture. Neelam had initially wanted to include it among the earlier acts of neglect. Seeing the date, she corrected herself: this damage had not caused the original catastrophe; it belonged to injustices committed during reconstruction. One person could commit wrongs at many different times, but erasing the boundaries between those times would destroy the evidence. She added a chronology to the new sheet.

Neelam brought a copy of Sharda's register of the dead. More important than many of its names were the question marks beside them. An editorial colleague said that journalism needed one enormous death toll; who would read so many individual stories? 'We will report only as many deaths as have been verified,' Neelam replied. 'We will not increase the number by calling the missing dead. Every name is an entire household's world.' The colleague fell silent and left the blank spaces in the list undisturbed.

In the morning sunlight, a crow perched on the broken lip of the factory chimney. Workers there were sorting surviving metal with their hands. Some pieces bore a chemical coating, so the Garal-Kosh's examination could not be postponed. Neelam asked why they continued working. 'We need pumps for water, parts for pumps, and this scrap for parts,' one worker said. Another added, 'But if we fall ill, who will operate the pumps?' Neelam put

the two statements side by side in her report. Reconstruction and safety were not separate incantations.

An assembly was held at which Maithili explained the conditional outcome of the vote. Neelam sat in the place reserved for journalists. Maithili said that more votes favoured the limited reconnection of the Kund-Witness and the Memory-Witness, but that no experiment could begin without testing, the right of refusal and a means of shutting it down. Some in the crowd applauded in hope of relief; others remained silent. Neelam recorded both. The distance between 'the vote has taken place' and 'the crisis is over' must remain visible.

That evening a young man brought Neelam a printed sheet of new calculations by a Witness Fragment. It claimed that certain orbital risks had decreased, but the source date was missing from the back of the sheet. The young man wanted some cheerful news published. 'We need hope,' Neelam told him, 'but not reassurance without grounds.' She waited for confirmation from Ira's office. In the meantime she published the division of fields and the public account of seed distribution. There was no need to withhold facts useful to citizens today for the sake of an unverified prediction about tomorrow.

During the third watch, an announcement came from Vaidehi's office: before the public hearing on responsibility for the Great Rupture, the evidence would be arranged into five parts. Each would separately identify verified statements, uncertain estimates, corrected entries and matters requiring further investigation. Neelam submitted her report in that form. Vaidehi asked why Bhaskar's crimes were recorded on a different sheet from the solar storm. 'A natural event does not issue orders to withhold food,' Neelam said. 'Human orders and natural fear cannot be examined in the same balance. They must be weighed separately.'

The hearing began. The first sheet presented the surviving scientific facts about the solar storm. The second contained evidence of neglected maintenance. The third concerned the policy of the warning network and the exhaustion of the public. The fourth recorded the Witness Fragment's admission of error and its limited effects. The fifth described Bhaskar's abuse of human authority and violations of the right to treatment. On the back of every sheet was a sentence stating what remained uncertain. Neelam resisted the temptation to end with a beautiful conclusion. People had gathered to hear the grounds for decisions, not a proclamation that the story was complete.

A woman rose halfway through the hearing. The pond where her village had cultivated makhana had been ruined, and since her husband's death she had been saving the seed by hand. 'Which of these five sheets will account for the new pond my village needs?' she asked. Neelam replied that the record of damage would be linked to public allocations for rebuilding; it would not be imprisoned within an account of historical blame. Hearing this, Vaidehi wrote a new instruction in the judicial register: 'The relation between the findings of an inquiry and decisions concerning relief must be made clear.' Whether the woman was satisfied remained uncertain. But her question had found a place in the document.

At the end Vaidehi asked Neelam whether she could choose a single name and declare it wholly responsible for the Great Rupture. Neelam lifted her five sheets. 'No. Some causes belonged to nature, some to human neglect, some to the policy of warnings, some to errors within the Witness, and some to Bhaskar's crimes. These things affected the same catastrophe in different ways. Do not combine them into one excuse.' In that refusal, Neelam's journalism had travelled a long way from its former haste.

No triumphant slogan rose from the assembly. People went on asking for the names of the dead, their shares of seed, the sites of their homes, and the account of water for the coming year. On the last sheet of her report Neelam wrote, 'The vote consented to a trial of limited reconnection; the trial has yet to take place. Power has not been restored to anyone. Accountability has begun.' She read the sheet aloud. Beneath the paper Vaidehi placed not her signature of ownership, but a mark of public receipt. Such a record did not belong to any one person.

When Neelam came out of the office that night, she saw smoke rising from small cooking fires behind the shattered factory chimney. Beneath a tree at the school, a child held a piece of an old computer and asked why it could not be made to work again. The teacher replied, 'First understand its source, its power and how to use it safely.' The sentence seemed to contain the meaning of all five sheets. At the next public trial, the limited reconnection of two Witness Fragments would be put to a real test. Today the people had only taken into their own hands the right to test it.

After the assembly dispersed, Neelam received an unexpected letter. It was written on the reverse of an old factory wage slip. The writer had given no name, but complained about the fifth sheet presented to the assembly. 'Blame Bhaskar,' it said, 'but what shall we call all those who kept obeying his orders?' Neelam closed her ledger and sat thinking. This question called for more than a new list of the guilty. It demanded distinctions between those who gave orders, those who profited, those who complied out of fear, and those who bent only in order to survive.

At dawn she went to Bhaskar's old supply storehouse. The worn symbol of 'Complete Akshar' remained on the wall. Inside, several women were distributing packets of fresh seed. One told her that under Bhaskar she had entered names on ration slips. Often she had known that a family's share was being cut unjustly, but she herself feared that her children would go hungry. Neelam asked whose orders she had followed. The woman gave a name, then added, 'Write it down, but don't call my child a criminal.'

Neelam understood that a public account of wrongdoing had to be both fair and attentive to suffering. She preserved the woman's statement in the original record and emphasized the chain of command in the published report. The evidence was sent to Vaidehi so that decisions about punishment would follow public law, rather than the journalist's immediate anger. Some readers would want Neelam to pronounce everyone guilty in advance. But her work was not to turn herself into a court of punishment. It was to place evidence before a court capable of judging it.

An old maintenance report received from the Memory-Witness contained the names of two inspectors. One had died after the Great Rupture; the other was still alive. The crowd wanted the first inspector held

responsible because his name stood clearly in the ledger. Neelam took testimony from the surviving inspector. He said that maintenance supplies had been requested but had never arrived. Neelam saw copies of the requisitions, yet none of them had proof of receipt. She wrote, 'Requests available; delivery remains unconfirmed.' It would be wrong to append a false certainty to the dead inspector's name.

Rajan brought an old public account book. The allocation for one year had been recorded in advance, but the actual materials arrived several months later. Neelam said that writing 'issued' in an office ledger and having the goods reach the site were two different events. Rajan agreed. Together they made separate registers for the funds sanctioned, the materials dispatched, their receipt at the site, and the inspection of their use. These distinctions might expose fraudulent supplies from the past, but not every improper delay was theft. Floods, broken roads and administrative indifference could also be causes.

That evening Neelam went to the school. Urmila was showing the children a torn sheet from an old factory plan. Seeing the clean lines drawn upon it, a child asked, 'If everything was drawn correctly, why did it break?' Urmila showed the children the actual wreckage: the sections still sound, those weakened by decay, and those for which no testing equipment was yet available. 'The shape drawn on paper and the thing that exists five years later are not the same,' Neelam said. 'To keep an account truthful, learn to distinguish times.' The child wrote the date on the empty edge of the plan.

The children were given an exercise: write three kinds of statement about one event—what you saw yourself, what someone told you, and what you found in a document. They chose the bridge washed away in the flood. One girl wrote that she had heard the bridge collapse but had not seen it. Another boy said his father had been there. The third sheet carried the date of the bridge's last inspection. Neelam said all three statements were useful, but added that none yet proved why the bridge had fallen. It was an exercise resembling a game, yet a new intellectual discipline was taking shape in the civilization.

A surviving craftsman from Suryakund asked to meet Neelam privately. He said that when the factory had fallen into great difficulty, some people had favoured abandoning mandatory safety tests. There had been pressure to provide electricity quickly because hospitals and pumps were shut. Once, he himself had supported such a proposal. Neelam asked whether he was prepared to give an account of his earlier decision. He wrote his name. 'The fear was mine,' he said. 'Weigh the consequences of my decision too, but do not forget the cries of the patients at that hour.'

Neelam saw another meaning in the testimony. When writing the history of mistaken decisions made in the name of public safety, decision-makers were not always merely selfish; sometimes they were afraid and confused. Yet fear did not erase the consequences. She told the craftsman that his written testimony would go to an independent inquiry; it was not a newspaper's function to pronounce him innocent or guilty on that basis. The craftsman did not breathe more easily. He still had to carry the weight of his earlier decision.

Neelam's editorial colleague urged her to give the five-part inquiry a sharper title—'The Crimes of the Machine', perhaps, or 'The Fall of Humanity'. Neelam refused. She wanted readers to trust her to ask truthful questions. She would not become a merchant of fear and return to the old circulation of rumours. The title remained: 'A Public Account of the Great Rupture: What Is Proven and What Remains'. The colleague warned that fewer people would read it. 'Then fewer may read it,' she replied, 'but those who need it will not be handed a dishonest conclusion.'

Another letter arrived from a farming village far away. Its residents complained that assemblies discussed the solar storm, but no one accounted for why their canal had not been dug for five years. Neelam requested the current allocation sheet from Rajan. She understood that the causes of destruction and responsibility for delays in rebuilding were different matters, but both became joined in the life of one village. At the end of her report she opened a new section concerning current policy: 'Do not conceal today's injustice in the name of the future.'

A public hearing was held in the village about the canal. The names of women who had worked to remove earth were missing from the labour register; only the men who collected wages were named. An elderly woman said that without the mud carried away by her hands the canal would not work, yet the register described her as a 'family helper'. Neelam published her testimony and wrote that making labour invisible was also a failure of reconstruction. If artificial intelligence distributed resources from such incomplete registers, an old inequality would be repeated within a new calculation.

A limited answer from the Memory-Witness showed the canal's former depth. A girl from Urmila's school measured the water there today and demonstrated how silt had accumulated. Neelam printed both measurements side by side. The Witness's old measurement was not wrong; the wrong would lie in presenting it as the present condition. This small example was not remote from the five-part public accounting. Truth was always situated in time and context. Citizens' verification was not an enemy of the instrument, but an indispensable companion to its answers.

Before the final hearing, Neelam received a list of the regions expected to benefit from the proposed reconnection. The town near Bhaskar's old centre stood high on it; villages across the river stood low. She asked Maithili how the conditional approval granted at the vote could be halted if it renewed the old inequality. Maithili replied that every stage of the test would make the record of regional access public, and that citizens could stop the process if a region was excluded without cause. Neelam asked for this answer as a written rule. A promise was not enough.

Vaidehi brought a draft regulation from her office. It described the limited reconnection of the instruments, provisions for a public shutdown, and the authority of local communities to decide when necessary. Neelam asked how an ordinary village assembly could actually issue an order to stop the process if the equipment stood in a distant factory. Vaidehi answered that without a physical means of stopping it, access to information, and trained human inspectors, the right would exist only on paper. The

forthcoming test must examine these arrangements. Neelam added a sentence: 'Show the route by which a right can be exercised.'

During the discussion, a small boy asked who would decide if Akshar ever fell silent. Maithili said that the rules of public consent and the joint decisions of doctors, farmers, craftspeople and citizens must continue to operate. Neelam entered the child's question in her notebook but did not turn it into a final philosophical revelation. The new generation's questions were still developing. The time for the final question of the tenth year had not yet arrived.

At last Neelam folded the five cloths and put them away separately. They did not reverse the flow of the Kosi or bring the dead back to life. But for the first time, in one assembly, the limits of science, administrative neglect, mistakes in information policy, errors of a Witness Fragment and the oppression of human government were being called by their own names. Empty spaces remained on the pages; Neelam did not regard them with hatred. Those blank places had to remain available for further evidence.

After Neelam's report appeared, a critic said that an account in five parts was too complicated. What use was it to an ordinary farmer? Neelam took him to a field being planted with paddy. One plot lacked water, another had received bad seed, and the wage register for a third was wrong. 'If we call all three the same disease, what shall we repair?' she asked. The critic stood with his feet in the mud and considered it. 'Distinguishing causes does not diminish people's rights,' Neelam said. 'It increases our ability to choose the right remedy.'

The name of a woman working in that field was missing from the allocation register. Neelam sent her testimony to Vaidehi's office. The reply said that no new public policy for the allocation of energy would be accepted without corrected accounts of individual labour. Neelam did not add a sixth sheet to her five. She explained that this was a decision about present reconstruction, not another item in the list of causes of the Great Rupture. Causes and remedies were related, but they were not the same thing.

At the evening school, the children wrote five questions in chalk upon the darkened screen of an old computer. The first was, 'What did I see?' The second, 'Whom did I hear it from?' The third, 'What date does the record bear?' The fourth, 'What do we not yet know?' The fifth, 'Whose rights will this change?' Neelam smiled at the questions. In all her years of journalism, the fifth had often been the one left behind. A hope was born there that the next generation would learn to ask it from the beginning.

Beyond the factory wreckage, the sky held not smoke but the pale colour of evening. Neelam looked up from her pages. Another solar storm might come, an instrument might err again, and human beings might once more become selfish. These were possibilities, not certain prophecies. The only certainty was that reconstruction without open accounts and the right to question could turn into a new power over people. She opened her register for the next day's work: the actual test of limited reconnection was still to come.

During the next watch, Vaidehi sent Neelam a letter. Separate inspectors were to be chosen for the preliminary trial of reconnecting the public Witnesses, but the proposed list had not a single representative from the

distant villages across the river. Neelam returned the sheet with a note: 'A trial is incomplete without the representation of those who will bear its consequences.' Vaidehi proposed an amendment in the assembly. One member claimed that people from remote villages could not understand technical matters. Urmila showed him the water-testing sheets prepared that very day by her schoolgirls. Limited access to knowledge was no ground for denying rights.

The next day Karnesh came to Neelam as he was changing the bandage on his left hand. He asked where his earlier decisions as a soldier belonged in the five-part account. Neelam said his part would be described wherever events were supported by evidence; an old military rank did not by itself establish either guilt or innocence. Karnesh asked whether it was necessary to describe the wound he had suffered for refusing an order. 'The wound is real,' Neelam answered, 'but it is not evidence concerning every other decision. Your right actions and your wrong ones will be examined separately.' Karnesh agreed.

An elderly woman from a family with someone missing told Neelam that the newspaper must have room for the missing alongside the names of the dead. Following the rules of Sharda's register, Neelam published two separate lists. The woman found her son's name on the second. 'At least you have not taken away the possibility that he is alive,' she said. Neelam did not make that sentence into an advertisement. This household's grief was not to be used to sell an article. She merely confirmed that the letters of the name were correct.

When the last copies were ready, Neelam turned the handwheel of her old printing press. Paper was scarce, so the first copy went to the village assembly, the second to the hospital and the third to the school. When a brief opening appeared in communications with Nabhgram, a concise, authenticated copy of the pages was sent into orbit. Neelam did not know whether the message had arrived; she left the space for acknowledgment empty. For her, that honesty about an empty space was a solid achievement. The pages of truth had not yet reached everywhere, but she would not sell them as though they had.

That night of the fifth year, the remaining pieces of firewood glowed faintly beside the hearth. Paddy seeds in the fields still awaited uncertain rain. Through the collapsed roof of the factory one could see the sky within. At the school a child held a piece of old wire and fashioned a question for a new calculation. Neelam read the final sentence of her public account: 'We cannot compress the catastrophe into one name. But we can make an open decision about how much authority we shall give to whom.' She put down her pen.

From beyond the distant Kosi the first boat of morning set out. It carried seed, medicine and copies of the five sheets, each an invitation to ask questions again.

Chapter 70: The Code of the Sky

Year Five, Second Half · Joint Hearing of Nabhgram-4 and Janakshetra

An unfamiliar stillness had settled over the old observation chamber of Nabhgram-4. Once, the lights of Earth had glittered one by one on a rotating map of the sky; now great stretches of that map lay desolate. Some signals had truly ceased, while from others no news had arrived. Ira Sen explained the distinction to her colleagues again and again. It was easy to declare dead those from whom no answer came, but such ease could close forever the paths by which many living people might yet return.

On the day of the first joint assembly in the latter half of the fifth year, she did not sit in her old chair. Fixed to its back was a small plaque bearing Nabhgram's founding constitution, declaring that all residents shared the same protection. Ira chose a low wooden seat beside it. Among the new representatives in the chamber was an elderly worker who had learned to steady himself in weightlessness, but whose five years of inadequate medical treatment had made it difficult to climb into a high seat. The assembly began with a small correction: everyone would sit at the same height.

The written message from distant Earth clearly stated the result of the vote. The People's Witness had conditionally approved a limited reconnection of two Witness Fragments, the Kund-Witness and the Memory-Witness. The Vajra-Witness, Storehouse-Witness, Garal-Witness, Kaal-Witness and Megh-Witness would remain within their respective separate limits. The approval did not mean that a new emperor could be made. Ira read the message three times: first with curiosity, then out of concern for the safety of her orbital settlement, and finally for the silent people who had been unable to vote because communications had broken down.

Before the assembly Ira had to answer one question. To whom should the remaining energy of the satellites and the available communications window be given first? One region of Earth needed information about medicine in a hospital; villages beyond the river wanted old water images to examine the condition of their seed fields; Nabhgram's own hospital sought a copy of an incomplete record relating to respiratory treatment. Every request was legitimate. Yet it was impossible to send every answer through the same narrow window. Ira told people this limitation first, instead of hiding it under the name of a machine's secret.

'Those of us who live in the sky should have the first claim on the arrangements of this chamber,' one representative said. Another answered, 'Without food from the fields below, what means of survival do we have?' Rather than silence either speaker, Ira made two columns on a sheet of paper. The first was headed 'Immediate necessities of life', the second 'Long-term consequences of the decision'. No mechanical calculation could make justice for itself between the two columns. Where people's rights were at stake, the final answer belonged to their assembly.

That day an image of an old orbital craft was placed before the assembly. One part of the craft was still circling in orbit, and the Memory-Witness held old figures concerning its motion. A current instrument had caught

one glimpse of it, but not its complete path. Under the separate rules of the Vajra-Witness, no authority existed to treat the fragment as an enemy and strike it. Ira remembered Karnesh's former dissent. Five years earlier such questions might have remained disputed; today, in order to protect their own food-carrying vessels, the assembly understood the need for that restraint.

A brief communications window opened for a joint hearing with Earth. Ira sent her initial proposals: estimates about orbital debris must not be presented as confirmed trajectories; information needed immediately to save life should take priority; communities on Earth affected by Nabhgram's decisions must have representation; and no military equipment of the Vajrajal network could be used privately without civilian consent. After the proposals she recorded the sources' dates, present uncertainties and deadline for replies. She did not suggest that every answer would arrive at once.

The first acknowledgment came from Janakshetra, but some letters at both ends of the message had been cut off. Ira did not fill the gaps by guessing. She remembered an old observation of Vachaspati's: the arrival of words and the arrival of their meaning intact were different things. She had read that thought repeatedly in Neelam's writings. Ira requested the message again. The caution cost her a communications window, but the delay was preferable to building a new code of the sky upon consent that had been wrongly assumed.

In Nabhgram's stores, a young woman displayed a surviving green leaf inside a little glass vessel. The settlement's agricultural experiment had endured days of incomplete light. 'If our remaining power goes into communications with Earth, for whom will this leaf survive?' she asked. 'Your question will be written first in the Code of the Sky,' Ira said. She was herself surprised by how urgently the light required by a single leaf called for an answer amid discussions of great vessels, satellites and military systems. She added to the proposal a minimum reserve of life-sustaining local power, which could not be reduced without an explicit decision by the citizens' assembly.

A second letter, delayed in transit from Earth, described the condition of farmers reported by Arunima. Paddy seedlings had survived in some fields beside the Kosi that year, but uneven water levels had damaged the makhana vines in a pond. In certain villages, people had suffered illness because they did not distinguish water for fish from water fit to drink. Arunima requested comparative images of the river's older courses, with the dates prominently displayed if the images were two years old. Ira placed the request on a list of civilian resources separate from military maps. She knew that one incorrect line could destroy an entire season for a farming family.

At the joint meeting an officer argued that distribution of supplies would become easier if the old Storehouse-Witness were reconnected. Ira showed him the written conditions of the vote. 'The authority of the five separate Fragments has not changed. To connect what has not been approved, calling it a convenience, would insult the people's mandate.' The officer was offended and accused Ira of keeping people hungry because of rules. Ira listened. The immediate hardships of hunger were real, but that fear could not become permission for unauthorized power. She asked for the list of

existing human distribution teams and announced public weighing sessions for rations beginning the next day.

On the board before them lay open the food accounts of three parts of the orbital settlement. In one, the infants' share had been recorded too low because births had never been entered in the old register. The machine's arithmetic was 'correct', but the register on which it worked was incomplete. Ira ordered a fresh count in the presence of the women who lived there. If identification papers had not survived, entitlements would be secured through testimony and verification by the settlement's assembly. The rule seemed to arise from the very question once asked by Mangala Devi's daughter on Earth: the absence of a document must not make a human life untouchable.

Suddenly a weak glimpse appeared of an old satellite from the Vajrajal network circling in the sky. The monitoring instrument's next report offered two estimates with a considerable difference between them. The first trial of the new code was before the assembly. Should a single definite figure for risk be announced in everyone's name? Ira said plainly that the available data gave two possible trajectories. She published both, with the limits of her confidence. Some in the assembly grew restless. Uncertainty was difficult to hear, but false certainty could lead to decisions far more deadly.

At night a brief message arrived from Karnesh. The injury to his left hand still made his writing crooked, but the words were firm: 'Authority to use defensive instruments is subject to the People's Witness's scrutiny. Do not make a military order the sole foundation of orbital rules.' In reply Ira did not ask about the wound. She asked, 'If a message from the citizens' assembly fails to arrive again, what decision will be lawful?' Karnesh's answer came some time later: 'Only previously approved minimum measures to protect innocent lives in immediate danger; no new authority to strike. Publish the reasons after the decision.' Ira added the answer to the final paragraph of her proposal.

At that night's meeting, some representatives questioned the legitimacy of the People's Witness vote. Not every citizen on Earth had been able to reach the polling places, and many votes from Nabhgram had arrived late. Ira acknowledged the failure of representation. The conditional decision, she said, was preliminary permission to test, not complete authority to begin an experiment at once; affected communities must have another opportunity to object. The absence of a representative must not be treated as permanent silence. This postponed the date of reconnection, but Ira recorded the reason for the delay openly before everyone.

In the first communications window at dawn, a letter arrived from Neelam. She asked whether merely describing the sky as 'shared property' would erase the old military claims made upon it. 'Changing a name does not change the history of ownership,' Ira replied. 'For anything preserved to protect civilian life, its use, risks and compensation for harm must all be in the public accounts.' That day the food register of Nabhgram and the account of the fields across Earth's river were read aloud at the same meeting for the first time. Their hungers and fears were different; yet both understood that dependence should rest not merely upon obedience, but upon mutual responsibility.

The assembly asked whether the surviving micro-engineering equipment could examine a damaged section of a spacecraft. The craftspeople explained separately the present condition of the equipment, the energy available and the inspection required. No miniature instrument could accomplish the whole repair by itself. Ira authorized a test, but had its purpose written as 'Examine condition', not 'Repair completed'. Beforehand they recorded who would bear responsibility for lost materials, injuries to workers or a new trajectory taken by the debris if the attempt failed.

An elderly member of a rescue team said that at the time of the Great Rupture one of his companions had died during a test called successful because the machine's records had survived while the human being's name had not. Ira asked him to provide the dead person's name. He lowered his eyes. He did not yet have all the papers certifying the death. Ira did not add the name to the register of 'Verified deaths', but to a list headed 'Supported testimony; confirmation pending'. For one family this was a painful wait, yet false documentation would be no honour to their grief.

As the draft of the Code of the Sky neared completion, one of Ira's former colleagues brought an objection. Rules this complicated, he argued, would prevent any action during an emergency. Ira handed him a simpler sheet. The first question was whether immediate harm to human life could be prevented. The second was whether sufficient direct evidence existed for the decision. The third was whether affected people had been heard. The fourth was whether the action could be stopped and examined. The fifth was who would bear the cost of putting things right if it proved wrong. 'The longer rules have grown from these five questions,' Ira said. 'Remove even one, and some people will quietly be left outside.'

That night an alert about an uncertain deviation in the path of orbital debris was sent towards Earth. Interference might halt the message halfway. Ira rejected a proposal to consume additional power by sending it three times. Preserving local life-saving energy, they transmitted a concise warning by two independent routes. It stated the probability, the time of observation and the limits of the next verification. Ira did not know whether people's fears diminished, but she refused to hide the danger and manufacture a false calm.

When the code was signed, something new happened. Officials had formerly written only their titles. Now each signature was accompanied by the names of the people or communities affected by the decision. Beside her own name, Ira had entered all residents of Nabhgram-4 and the village assemblies along the Kosi, although final approval from the distant assemblies was still awaited. A date was written above the space left blank. It belonged to future questions, not to a secret power.

Through the final communications window came a message from Maithili. Earth's power network had agreed to provide a brief period for testing the arrangement, but the hospitals' night supply would not be cut. Before the limited information from the Kund-Witness was compared with the Memory-Witness's older records, independent copies of both would be kept. Ira checked the message against the new code: source, limits, public rights and a real means of stopping the process were all written down. She gave permission for the check within the narrow communications window. The authority to shut it down would remain in the people's hands.

During the last watch, the small glass vessel of Nabhgram was brought before Ira again. One side of the green leaf had dried out; on the other a tender new shoot could be seen. The people of the settlement did not call it a miracle. A young woman explained that a prescribed share of light had been reserved, and the resulting loss to other delicate instruments was recorded separately. Ira read the account. Upon that leaf was written the unspoken meaning of the Code of the Sky: weigh truthfully what survives, do not hide the names of what has been lost, and do not make what is built anew the property of one person alone.

Before agreement on the rules could be reached, Ira had to attend a separate meeting of Nabhgram's craftspeople. A strip of metal from a broken vessel lay upon the table. According to the craftspeople, it might be usable again, but the condition of the dust it shed was unknown. A trader had immediately promised to send it to Earth, where metal was scarce for constructing pump frames. Ira made it clear that sending unknown residue directly into fields and homes was not a distribution of shared resources but a transfer of danger. Testing must come first, followed by a public list of safe uses. The trader withdrew, but in the craftspeople's eyes there was relief that their caution had not been treated as opposition to work.

An elderly craftsman showed an old instrument made by his son. Before the Great Rupture it had been used to examine the outer layer of orbital metals; now an essential component was missing. 'I know how it was made,' the craftsman said, 'but knowing does not mean that all its parts can be found today.' Ira entered his observation in the resources section of the code. Knowledge, materials, energy and safe use became four separate conditions. Civilian rights did not mean merely being allowed to press an instrument's button; there must also be a way to learn whether the thing was safe.

The settlements of Janakshetra on Earth had sent an informal letter. Some families had once lived near the ruined portion of a water channel. An image from space showed a possible boundary of flooding in the area. Seeing it, several officials considered emptying every house. Urmila wrote that the image did not clearly distinguish light from shadow; without a local inspection they could not know how high the water had actually risen. Ira read the letter aloud to the assembly. 'What is seen from the sky is one kind of evidence about that village,' she said. 'The mud clinging to the villagers' feet is another.' No order to displace them would be issued until the two were compared.

A representative of Nabhgram's public-health team then stood up. She was concerned that giving communications time to patients in Janakshetra might delay information needed for treatment in Nabhgram itself. Ira did not declare either group heroic. She proposed priorities based on the time of requests and the immediate danger to patients, with arrangements for instant objection if those priorities proved mistaken. A doctor from another region added that patients' privacy must not be made public without consent. With so little communication available, they chose to send essential clinical details without unnecessary names. The protection of life and privacy need not remain enemies.

A new representative proposed dividing communications time in proportion to the number of people from each region who had participated in the vote. It sounded simple, but Ira asked whether a village whose radio

had been broken for five years should receive less time because its people had been unable to vote. Silence fell upon the assembly. The proposal was revised: every region would receive a minimum life-saving share, followed by additional time assigned according to need and openly assessed risk. Nabhgram lost some conveniences under this decision. Ira had the loss entered in the public accounts. Equality did not require anyone's sacrifice to be rendered invisible.

In the middle of the day a letter arrived from a school on Earth. Children had written small questions on pieces of an old computer. They wanted to know how many satellites there were in the sky. Ira wrote down the original number of the Vajrajal network's satellites—144—but beside the number still active she wrote 'Confirmation pending'. 'Our history records 144,' she answered. 'We will not say how many still work until an independent examination has established it.' The question became a first lesson in computing: a number written in a register was not necessarily the number in the world today.

On another sheet, the children asked whether Zero-Remnant was merely rubbish. Ira wrote that it could increase danger, but that every fragment had a different history of manufacture: some were pieces of old vessels, some the remains of accidents, some military equipment. Calling them by one name made examining their risks easier, but did not make the responsibility of those connected with them identical. She had a little picture drawn in which one orbital path was left empty. Beneath it were the words, 'Do not assume that what has not been observed is safe.'

At one point disagreement in the assembly grew fierce. Some asked why they should not abandon such limited cooperation and leave every decision entirely to human beings. Ira answered with her own experience. On the first night of the Great Rupture she had received many broken reports about orbital debris, and it had taken the human assembly a long time to reconcile the uncertain figures. Assistance from instruments could be invaluable. Yet where the dates of reports were unclear, one false certainty might incite an attack. 'Abandoning assistance is not an answer,' she said. 'Neither is closing our eyes to its limitations.'

Then an elderly woman spoke of a missing relative. Her son had served in an orbital rescue team. After an accident, an automated register had marked his name 'Transfer completed', but he had never reached home. Later it emerged that the team's general records had been transferred, not the man himself. For five years the woman had struggled to have the official words corrected. Ira listened to the paper herself and ordered a corrected entry for the old phrase. She made clear that a family's grief was not a bargaining chip to exchange for a bureaucratic correction. Only what could actually be established about the son's condition was entered.

A small group compared the new code to Bhaskar's old Akshar Pavilion. Bhaskar, they said, had also introduced rules in the name of protecting life, but later made access to food and treatment the price of obedience. Ira did not mock the comparison. She added an explicit line: citizens' rights to food, water, shelter and treatment would not depend upon an instrument's consent or political loyalty. Supplies were difficult in orbit, but fair distribution of scarcity must never include punishment for dissent. There

was little opposition to the clause, yet Ira said its real test would come later, in the way it was observed.

At dusk a second image of the river's course reached them from Janakshetra. During comparison with an older image, a limited information service under the Memory-Witness suggested the river's former channel. Ira marked it 'Advice', not an administrative instruction. Only after Urmila's students sent a report from the ground would its use be decided. Through this modest procedure, before the two Witness Fragments were reconnected, a rule had been established: between an old history and the present earth, human testimony was indispensable.

A representative became troubled after reading a confidential message. It claimed that a powerful faction on Earth was secretly taking away some of Nabhgram's resources. The seal of authentication was clear, but the message contained no independent account of quantities or supplies. Ira recalled Neelam's earlier research: a source's signature might be genuine without making its accusation true. She publicly recorded receipt of the message, labelled the claim 'Unverified', and opened the supply ledgers. The speed of the rumour diminished, but the right to question the suspicion was not closed.

Before the final vote, the delegates read every page of the code once more. A student suggested that instead of the difficult legal phrase 'Irrevocable autonomous governing authority is prohibited', the explanation should say, 'A machine shall not become king on its own.' An elderly jurist replied that the precise legal wording was also necessary. In the end both sentences were retained: the first as law, the second as an explanation for children. Ira saw real progress in that small agreement. Keeping knowledge apart from the language of ordinary people was itself one path towards power over them.

There was not enough paper for copies of the code. After checking an old printing device, they produced a dozen copies; the remaining pages were copied by hand. Each copy bore the source date and the copyist's name. Some sheets were wrapped in cloth because they might get wet on the journey to villages across the river. Ira did not regard such expedients as evidence of the past's weakness. If a civilization's memory survived in many media, the breaking of one network would not kill every question.

At the day's end a representative asked, 'If the reconnection takes place, will this Code of the Sky be capable of change?' 'Certainly,' Ira answered. 'A rule that cannot be changed becomes a prison for the mistakes of the future. But the reasons for a change, the older wording and the consent of those affected must all remain public.' She drew up a schedule for revision: a mandatory review after one year, an immediate hearing when unexpected harm occurred, and independent human examination of machine warnings. The basis of trust was not the machine's perpetual truthfulness but the community's capacity to correct itself.

One further problem remained. Workers employed on orbital vessels were listed in old military registers, but not in civilian ones. When compensation for injury was due, officials classified them as 'independent soldiers' and withheld assistance from surviving families. Ira examined the foundations of both registers. The actual character of the work, the nature of the orders and the family's circumstances must be investigated; rights were not to be determined by a department's title. At this decision a widow

quietly placed a small tool made by her husband upon the table. 'This is evidence of his work,' she said. Ira assigned an independent team to examine its use, but recorded the widow's testimony at once.

A letter from a town on Earth described Nabhgram as the owner of old scientific records. The town wanted to use them to build new farming equipment, but a fee was being demanded for access. Ira examined Nabhgram's older practices. Before the Great Rupture some archives had belonged to private companies, others to the public. She made it clear that reasonable access to essential information concerning treatment, water and food must not be obstructed; disputes over private claims would be heard separately. Beside the word 'Right', she had written 'Means of use', for opening an archive was incomplete if people lacked the equipment with which to read it.

A young man of Nabhgram asked Ira whether, after all these disputes, he would ever regain the ease of his former life. She did not answer immediately. For many years she had been neither a full citizen upon Earth nor entirely at home in the sky. Now they were making a new life from a small dwelling, a surviving leaf, shared meals and mistakes admitted openly. 'We shall not remake the old days,' she said, 'but we can make days in which your demand for an answer is not a crime.' After a long time the young man smiled.

That night, during the next orbital communications window, a plan was approved to dispatch a small consignment of food towards Earth. Ira made clear that 'Dispatched' did not prove 'Received'. A reply acknowledging its arrival would be awaited, and any warning of danger en route would require the decision to be heard again. Her colleagues were tired of the detail in these accounts. Yet the small consignment might become the hope of a hungry family. Ira sent it away not in the glitter of reassurance but with the caution of truth.

The final copy of the code lay on the assembly's outer table. Comparing it with another version, a student caught a change in one word: one sheet said 'may', while the other said 'will'. Ira understood the weight of the difference. Turning possibility into certainty was often the first step towards a political order. The faulty sheet was set aside and the date and reason for the correction recorded. She realized that this humble examination of words was no less necessary than the great watch kept over the sky.

Through the window of Nabhgram-4, Earth appeared not as one luminous sphere but as a changing map of wounds and light. Ira had spent a great part of her life looking at it from afar, and after the Great Rupture the debris of Earth had ceased to be separate from the wreckage of her own home. In the day's final record she wrote, 'Code approved; result of the trial still undetermined.' It was the first accountable promise of orbital cooperation. It would not bring back the dead or make every pump work. But Ira knew that the light of a new fire might begin with the acceptance of uncertainty.

Chapter 71: The New Generation's Question

Year Five, Second Half · Old Suryakund Workshop, Janakshetra

When Urmila reached the gate of the old Suryakund Centre, the light of dawn was coming through the gaps in its broken walls. She had returned to this place again and again over the five years, and each time the same sight had acquired another meaning. At first it had stood for fear; later it became a workshop for salvaged metal and machine parts. Today it was to witness the first public trial of a limited reconnection between two witness-segments. She had brought an inspection register, a copy of the settlement's vote, and questions written by the girls at her school. According to the plan, everything would proceed in an order settled beforehand. Urmila knew that the actual world would nevertheless put forward questions of its own.

Across the Centre's outer courtyard, iron beams from the old factory lay scattered, while local craftspeople worked beneath shelters they had raised with bamboo. To one side Karnesh, his hand still bandaged, was counting those present. Two fingers of his left hand had not yet recovered their full movement. His injury had been discussed often enough at public meetings, but Urmila understood that such wounds were not prizes bestowed upon a story. Karnesh had come today not as a guard but as a citizen-witness. His hand trembled when he made his mark. His presence mattered because the right to ask questions needed his support.

The first task of the trial was not to start a machine but to inspect the premises. With the craftspeople, Urmila checked the electrical chamber, the remaining reserves, the damaged components that had been isolated, and the accounts of the hospital's protected supply. She asked which services would be preserved first if the available energy declined during the trial. The technical team had already separated the hospital's supply, but the proof of that separation existed only on paper. 'What we must test today,' Urmila said, 'is whether a boundary drawn on paper can also remain a boundary in practice.'

Vaidehi Raut, representing the People's Witness Assembly, read out the authorization. The vote had approved only a limited, testable reconnection between the Kund-Witness and the Memory-Witness; the other five segments were to remain independent. No machine would receive governing authority, command over weapons, or sole control of grain distribution. If a verified, unforeseen danger appeared during the trial, human inspectors could stop it. At this point Urmila raised a question: 'We may say that it must stop, and it will obey—but what actual means do we possess between those two moments?' Vaidehi replied that the day's trial was meant to answer precisely that question.

The old Memory-Witness was ready to answer through a restricted interface. Its voice resembled the voice heard five years earlier, but Urmila refused to take that resemblance as complete proof of identity. They compared the records of the original source, local access, and the marks of independent verification. An inspector asked whether the Memory-Witness

could acknowledge its previous errors. The reply came: 'I possess many older sets of data. Some gaps in time, differences of context, and a former erroneous threshold for warnings are recorded. I cannot directly observe the present site.' The admission deserved respect, but Urmila asked again who would bear the cost if the machine offered another wrong recommendation.

A new report arrived from a village pump. The old computer's memory described its original construction clearly, but three years earlier local craftspeople had replaced parts of it with new components. The witness-segment's first recommendation rested on the old design. Urmila opened an earlier page of her inspection register: once before, that very mistake had forced them to suspend a repair. Now a new photograph and the craftsperson's testimony were added to the record. Instead of immediately revising its reply, the machine stated that it lacked sufficient evidence to verify the pump's present condition. Urmila regarded that inability not as failure but as a first necessary sign of honesty.

Representatives of several village assemblies had travelled far to observe the trial. One woman's field was still fallow because the old water channel had filled with earth. She asked whether reconnecting the witness-segments would bring water to her land. Urmila explained that joining information would not clear the channel by itself, nor would damaged soil immediately become fertile. A reliable account of the water might help people decide fairly how to distribute labour and materials. 'Then do not write in your records that our channel is working without first looking at the soil in our village,' the woman said. Urmila recorded a date for inspection, not a promise of success.

In a corner of the workshop, paper registers had been preserved in an old metal cupboard that the rains had spared. Two girls from a village school had come to copy the documents. Their assignment was not to operate the machine's interface but to check transcriptions of earlier human decisions. One page understated the number of workers; another gave a higher figure for an old grain allocation. Beside the original entries the girls wrote, 'Different sources.' Urmila was pleased that education was becoming not merely the art of accepting a machine's answers but the art of questioning them.

For the trial, the Kund-Witness's limited service reported the condition of a small energy sector. It stated plainly that it did not possess a complete picture of the current power flow. Its information was compared with measurements from two independent instruments. One reading was slightly different. The technical team said the difference might fall within the normal range. 'On what date was the test establishing that normal range conducted?' Urmila asked. No immediate answer came. An old inspection register supplied a reasonable limit, but a second examination of the present components was still judged necessary. The trial was postponed for a while.

A young craftsperson grew impatient with the delay. His village well had been out of order for two months, and he had come hoping that Suryakund's assistance would hasten the work. Urmila saw the hardened skin on his hands and listened patiently. 'If we join defective parts together in haste,' she told him, 'your village will have to pay the price again.' 'But every day we wait has a price too,' the young man answered, 'and it is we who pay

it.' He was right. Urmila wrote the reason for the postponement and the next possible date on a public notice, while authorizing a separate team to repair the village's hand pump in the meantime. Respect for a trial did not mean ignoring present needs.

At midday a false report began to spread: the Complete Akshar was being awakened again, and control of every storehouse would pass into its hands. The remnants of Bhaskar's old slogan could still be seen, worn away on some walls. Neelam checked the source of the rumour and explained that no such wording appeared anywhere in the new trial documents. Vaidehi made a public announcement: two restricted information services, five independent segments, and the citizens' right to stop the operation. Urmila urged everyone present to read out those three points upon returning to their villages. Confusion could not be dispelled by treating distrust as an insult. The details of the trial had to reach the people in their own language.

Authorization for the first limited reconnection extended only to comparing selected records from the two sources. The witnesses exchanged information but made no final public decision. They found sufficient protective information about one part of the old energy network. Some differences remained between their answers, because the Memory-Witness's records were old and the Kund-Witness could observe only part of the present system. Urmila had both sets of figures entered on the same sheet, each bearing its own date. She refused to average them merely to create an appearance of agreement. Putting two incomplete truths together does not give birth to a complete truth.

Then an unexpected warning interrupted the trial. The reconnected service was proceeding on the assumption that a water pump was working normally, while news arrived from the site that the temperature of a newly fitted component was rising. Relying on the older data already available, the service had rated the risk as low. Urmila decided that its advice must not enter public use. She asked the inspectorate to impose an independent suspension. Two members agreed; one disagreed. Urmila had the dissenter's reasoning recorded as well, because concealing the existence of dissent does not strengthen agreement.

The machine examiner said that the warning could not be taken as proof of a new danger until a second inspection had been carried out. 'I am not saying that a defect has been established,' Urmila replied. 'I am saying only that, in an uncertain situation, it is improper to experiment upon a public supply.' She exercised the stipulated power of suspension. At a separately marked boundary, the human team responsible for dividing electrical supply stopped the power assigned to the trial. The suspension appeared clearly on the Memory-Witness's interface. The Kund-Witness responded: 'Human suspension received. No new estimate will be published.' There was no claim to omniscience in that answer, but there was a visible act of obedience.

Everyone in the room looked at everyone else. Many would call this suspension a failure of the machine. Urmila understood that the vote had been held for precisely this kind of test: the ability to stop the system when danger appeared. Yet the trial was not finished. She asked what the suspension had done to the hospital, the field pumps, and the workshop's essential supply. The human team's report said the separate protected

network had continued its work as before. Two craftspeople, however, had been unable to complete their scheduled repairs that day. Urmila recorded their names, their work, and the loss they had suffered. Exercising a civic right also carried a social cost; that cost must not be hidden.

Five kinds of statements were entered separately in the inspection register: the machine's recommendation, what had been observed on the site, the craftsperson's testimony, the examiner's inference, and the citizens' final decision. Vaidehi approved the arrangement. Urmila resolved to send it to the school so that children would understand that scientific truth was still made through questions, correction, and the recognition of available limits. A schoolgirl asked whether, now that people had the right to stop the machine, it would never make a mistake again. 'The possibility of error will remain,' Urmila said. 'The importance of this right is not that it denies that possibility, but that it keeps open the way to deal with it.'

By midday Sharda came from the hospital. She watched a small part of the trial and asked whether any treatment records had been sent to the machine's shared archive without the patients' consent. The inspector said that the shared test contained only brief indicators of need, without names. Sharda examined a copy herself. One entry might still reveal someone's identity, since that person was the only inhabitant of the village with the illness concerned. The entry was secured. Urmila learned that deleting a name does not always protect privacy. People's actual lives are more complex than the numbers in an account.

Another problem arose among the people themselves. News that the trial had been temporarily suspended reached a distant settlement, but the full explanation did not. People began saying that a woman from the village assembly had obstructed the progress of the machines. Urmila had heard such accusations before. She sent a short account containing the time of her decision, the grounds for it, and the dissenting inspector's opinion. 'The decision was mine, but the examination belongs to everyone,' she wrote. If fresh evidence appeared, the way to change the decision remained open. She had no wish to keep the trial closed merely to protect her own prestige.

At the evening meal, the craftspeople shared a simple plate of coarse-grain bread and vegetables. Sitting among them, Urmila listened to their discussion of what the rules of wages would be if the factory resumed work in a new form. One worker said that, in the old factory, information about danger had been kept inside the officers' rooms. Now those who operated the equipment must have the right to understand its risks. Another insisted that women's and men's names should both appear in the wage accounts. Urmila did not set this conversation apart from the technical trial. Without human hands, a computer's memory does not become a machine; without the rights of those hands, what passes for progress cannot become justice.

Another message from the sky arrived during the day's trial. Under Ira's shared code, a discrepancy had been found in the possible path of a piece of orbital debris; a final conclusion remained outstanding. Urmila entered the report in the workshop's risk register, but she did not order the entire site evacuated on the strength of an uncertain orbital signal. Local preparations, an independent means of communication, and the approved rules for public protection were checked. The committee would meet again if an objection

arose. Bringing evidence from two separate crises together required patience. One fear could not usurp the authority of another.

The technical team closed its weary eyes in the hope that the trial might resume the next morning. Taking a former schoolgirl with her, Urmila went to inspect the separate shutdown mechanism. 'What happens if I am not here,' she asked, 'and the person who holds authority is far away?' The inspector said that a second list of trained local representatives had been prepared and that the power to stop the system in an emergency was not tied to any single office. Urmila checked each representative's name, means of contact, and state of training. A right written on paper remains only a promise if it cannot reach the machine in front of which it must be exercised.

In the second stage of the trial, some current data were deliberately withheld—not to trap the services into making wrong decisions, but to see how they would acknowledge their limits. Both segments said clearly that they could not estimate the present outcome without an adequate basis. Urmila marked her approval, but also asked what further information would be needed when that basis became available. The services supplied a list: inspection on site, the present condition of the components, and an independent reading of the energy reserve. Such answers could save labour without seizing the right to decide.

The first audit of the limited reconnection between the two witness-segments was opened before the assembly. Successful messages, suspended advice, unavailable information, human intervention, and services that had remained secure were entered in separate columns. No sheet contained the words 'Complete Reawakening.' Vaidehi read out the decision: the trial could continue so long as its conditions were respected, but any permanent expansion would require a fresh public hearing. This was neither a cry of victory nor a lament for universal ruin. It was a difficult, truthful admission by society: tools were useful, and so were the people who could stop them.

In the evening Urmila opened the schoolgirls' pages once more. One contained a small drawing: a pump on one side, a field on the other, two signatures between them, and a mark reading 'Inspection pending.' Urmila understood why the girls had drawn it. Without that mark, old plans had all appeared complete even when no water reached the fields. Now an empty space was not a fault to be concealed but an invitation to investigate. She decided that, in the next school year, children would study the records of unsuccessful trials as well, so that the history of science would not become a monument to success alone.

While inspecting the site that day, Urmila came upon an old water-purification chamber. Outside it was the broken sign of the Garal-Kosh. Some suggested using the surviving metal from this section to build frames for pumps. Aniruddha's earlier examination had identified the possibility of chemical contamination there. It would be improper to call the material safe without a present test. With the craftspeople, Urmila placed a public warning on the restricted section, while leaving open a separate route for inspecting materials from the safe area beyond it. 'Not all scrap is poisonous,' she said, 'but not all shining metal is useful, either.'

A woman craftsperson searched Urmila's list for her own name. In the old wage register, her work had been entered under her husband's name, although she herself had been sorting components for five years. When specialists had been chosen for the new trial, the committee had left her out as a 'family assistant.' Urmila examined the inspection sheet the woman had prepared. It clearly identified the locations of defects, the times when equipment had been used, and the number of inspections already completed. Urmila proposed placing her on the list of official inspectors. Some officers objected that she lacked a certificate. Urmila replied that the evidence of her experience should be examined and that, if further training was required, it should be made available. Invisible labour must not be punished once again.

During the trial a health worker brought an old sheet of figures. It contained the number of infant deaths in the third year, a figure repeatedly cited during the dispute over Sahadev's prohibition of machines. The health worker asked whether it would now become part of the decisions affecting health. Urmila repeated Sharda's rule: confirmed deaths, missing people, and unverified incidents must be recorded separately; no dead child should be turned into an instrument of ideology. Deepa's name was spoken in the assembly. Everyone fell silent. An error can be corrected, but a death cannot be undone. The memory of that difference ran deeper than any inspection of machinery.

A representative of the farmers arrived carrying earth from his field. He said that if the Kund-Witness could calculate the distribution of water correctly, the fallow fields of his village would grow crops again. Urmila placed her hand upon the little mound of earth. 'This soil is not an enemy of science,' she said, 'but it will not move according to lines drawn on paper.' The farmer gave his account: after the flood, silt lay across some areas, sand had accumulated in others, and the old courses of water had changed in still others. The committee sent the account for verification. The witness-segment's assistance could help organize a real inspection of the soil, not replace one.

For a short interval a message from Ira reached them from Nabhgram-4. She warned that the new estimate concerning orbital debris produced two different outcomes; it would be improper to cut orbital communications in order to accommodate the energy trial on Earth. Urmila requested the current account of communications allocation from the technical team. One officer replied that an 'appropriate quantity' had been protected. 'Appropriate for whom?' Urmila asked. 'How much, for how long, and where is the message acknowledging receipt from the people in orbit?' Any additional intervention was suspended pending an orbital reply. Convenience for those dwelling on Earth could not be purchased with the silence of the orbital inhabitants.

As the day declined, the craftspeople brought out the inactive screen of an old computer. A student read the year of manufacture inscribed on its back. Nothing appeared on the screen now, and nobody had confirmed whether the memory inside it had survived. Some declared that the screen must be made to work if the knowledge of the old civilization was to be recovered. Smiling, Urmila said that pages, books, the experience of living craftspeople, and printed archives were also vessels of knowledge. It would be

good if the computer survived, but knowledge was not imprisoned within it. The student put the screen away safely again, resisting the urge to break it open in search of its memory.

When the machine's answers repeatedly leaned in one direction, the inspectors looked for the reason. An old allocation register contained extensive details of the needs of a large city, while the pages concerning villages across the river were almost empty. The Kund-Witness drew upon that old register; consequently, the estimate of benefits to the city appeared much more definite. Urmila told the committee that applying the same formula to unequal sources could conceal unequal results. Where information was incomplete, she proposed, people should not be judged less needy; their circumstances should instead receive priority for independent investigation.

A city representative objected that a new calculation would hold up work in his town. Urmila answered that the decision was to improve the evidence, not to stop the work. No one was discounting the actual needs of the city's hospital. But the unrecorded patients of a distant village were human beings too. She placed two examples before him: a functioning city hospital with a public register, and a medical camp operating beneath a tree that had no official name. If the calculations saw only the first, the children in the second would become invisible. The representative fell silent. Later he promised that volunteers from his city would help count the people served by the distant camp.

Before nightfall, Vaidehi conducted a short test in which the person normally empowered to order a local suspension was treated as absent. Urmila deliberately left the room. In the emergency exercise, a second trained inspector presented the written reasons for suspension, the evidence available, and an account of the protected services. The result complied with the rules. On returning, Urmila saw that the right did not depend upon her name. It was a moment of relief. If an entire system rested upon one person, that person's absence tomorrow would fill it with new fear.

After the exercise, the craftspeople displayed their work. A woman had made a device that used a small turning wheel to mark water samples, but it still required official testing. Urmila said that the instrument might prove useful; to establish that, its materials must be examined, its measurements repeated, and its possible errors understood. The woman was not disappointed. 'I am glad that something I have made will be tested,' she said. 'Only do not reject it because the person who made it is a woman.' Urmila proposed writing those words above the entrance to the workshop.

That evening a small schoolboy showed Urmila the last page of an old ledger. At the time of the Great Rupture, his father had gone to operate machinery and had never returned. The boy wanted his father's name entered in the book. Urmila explained Sharda's procedure for the registers of the dead and missing. The name would be entered, she said, but its status would be recorded only to the extent that it could be established. The boy agreed. He had no old photograph, but he possessed a bamboo measuring tool his father had made. Urmila arranged for a copy of it to be recorded. Memory does not endure only in the pulse of numbers; it lives in the work of hands as well.

The answers from the Kund-Witness and the Memory-Witness suggested a new possible use. By bringing together the dates of earlier repairs and the current limits of energy, they could organize the need for future inspections. Ira and Neelam required independent verification before such information could be put to public use. Urmila said that the next stage of the trial would need a real list of craftspeople, safe access to the work, and plans for alternative employment. A service might suggest which section should be inspected first. But which worker would take a risk with their life must be decided through open consent.

At the close of the assembly, an officer asked Urmila whether, after so many inspections, she trusted the machine. She looked at the two pages before her: one recorded the successful exercise of the right to stop it; the other showed an incomplete map of water supply. 'I will not give it blind faith,' she said. 'I will give it a fair chance to be examined, stop it when an error is found, and accept what proves useful.' It was the answer to a long journey that had begun at Sahadev's school. Both the rejection of machines and their worship were proving too small for the multiplicity of life.

At night Urmila returned toward her village. Along the road she could make out, within the same darkness, the shade of trees, a half-filled channel, two small working pumps, and the chimney of a collapsed factory. From one house came the sound of a child in pain. That child needed a doctor, not an omniscient machine. In another courtyard an old woman was sorting seeds by hand; she needed light, water, and a secure share of what was distributed. Urmila understood that one successful suspension was not merely a principle of government. It was a practical rule made for the sake of all these homes.

That night a teacher came to Urmila to ask for copies of the trial record. He wanted the children to read the next day about the successful stopping of the machine. Urmila asked whether he would also teach them the reasons behind the failed recommendation, the delayed repairs, and the unanswered questions. He said yes. He prepared a sheet for the school: what was observed; what the machine said; what people verified; what remained unknown; and what was decided. At the bottom Urmila wrote that every pupil was free to test that decision with questions. In this way, a school lesson became practice in public government.

A representative from another village asked once more which side the machine's calculation would favour if the hospital's need for power and the field pumps' need increased at the same time. Urmila replied that a calculation could set out the possible consequences of both choices, but people themselves must decide the rules of just priority. She invited Sharda and Arunima to a joint meeting. It was easy to make patients and farmers rivals. What they needed was a plan that reduced the loss of life and livelihood on both sides as far as possible, and accepted public responsibility for whatever could not be saved.

As she closed the last page, Urmila thought for a moment of Sahadev. He had been a man afraid of machines, yet there was history within his fear. Mocking it would not erase a child's death. She decided to send him a copy of the new trial. She would demand no agreement from him, only offer open evidence. Sahadev might reject it; even then, his right to ask questions

would remain secure. In accepting this, companionship in the search for truth gathered the courage not to silence its opponent but to reason with him.

Turning back, Urmila fixed a small notice to the school door. The failed recommendation and the successful suspension could be read without charge. For those who found reading difficult, there would be a collective reading each week. If only those who knew the language of officials could ask questions, authority would once more remain in a handful of hands. She wanted even the old women of the riverside villages to know which decision had been stopped that day, why, and when it would be examined again.

On reaching home she wrote on the day's last page: 'Two witness-segments connected on a limited basis; five remain separate. Local suspension succeeded following an erroneous recommendation; some repairs were delayed; the hospital's essential supply remained secure. Further testing required.' She held her pen still for a while after writing those words. A question returned to her: if the next generation ceased to practise this right, would today's shutdown mechanism become another dead piece of paper? She decided that the following day she would show every boy and girl at the school how the test worked. A right is inherited not through signatures alone, but through practice.

Chapter 72: The Inheritance of Agnivansh

Tenth Year after the Great Rupture · Janakshetra, the Kosi Riverbank and the New School

At dawn in the tenth year, a small fishing boat came slowly across the Kosi towards the landing. On one side lay bundles of seed; on the other, small implements made of dried bamboo. The people seated at the landing weighed the goods and entered names in a register. Some of those names matched the old records, while others were being recorded for the first time in the new settlements. Watching this ordinary work, Maithili wondered how long a civilization endured—in the splendour of great factories, or in the just portion of food unloaded from a boat crossing the river. Ten years earlier, people at this landing had been unable to save their homes. Now boats came and went again. Yet beside the landing, a pillar of the washed-away bridge still stood in the water.

Maithili carried some papers and an old token of remembrance. Today the People's Witness Assembly was holding its annual examination at the new school in Janakshetra, and the next generation would be shown directly how machines could assist them and how they could exercise the right to stop those machines. No state festival had been proclaimed for the occasion. Sharda had insisted that the memory of the dead was lost amid celebrations; Urmila had insisted that if the examination remained confined to officials, the right itself would remain imprisoned on paper. Both had been heard. The school courtyard would be open, while trained people would remain responsible for the safety inspection of the equipment inside.

The changes of ten years in Janakshetra could not be taken in at a glance. Here stood new houses with sheltered roofs, there the fallen walls of old ones; here women gathered water around a hand pump, there a communal light was powered by surviving pieces of solar storage equipment. In one lane half of an old factory chimney still rose into the sky. Beneath it a small workshop was operating, where craftspeople repaired farm implements, pump mechanisms, and school benches. Two sections beside it remained closed for want of adequate inspection. Maithili felt relief on seeing those shut gates. A sign of caution was not an insult to development but a reminder of its history.

Green waves of paddy rippled across one field, while a heap of sand still occupied another. Leaves were scattered over parts of the makhana ponds, but the old polluted pond remained closed to cultivation. A woman selling fish said that a new system had been introduced, yet the fare for carrying her boat to market had increased. Maithili listened. At the citizens' vote five years earlier, the People's Witness Assembly had said that the fruits of reconstruction would not reach every place at the same time. Ten years later, this remained true. It was useful to display figures of improvement, but the household whose cooking fire had not been lit today could not eat an average success rate.

Urmila's school was no longer a single shelter beneath a tree. It had three rooms, a secure table for testing water, a cupboard of old books, and a small computer-study room. The study room did not remain open at all times: energy was limited, the components required maintenance, and the assistant services could be used only in the presence of trained inspectors. Students were first taught to count by hand, examine soil, and distinguish forms of written evidence; only then were they shown the available computerized archives. 'Let the question stay alive even without a screen,' Urmila said. 'Then the screen can serve us well.' In those words Maithili heard both the fear that had lived at Sahadev's school and the patience required to pass beyond it.

Karnesh sat at the school entrance. Two fingers on his left hand still had limited movement; he had learned to hold a pen properly in his other hand. The injury recalled a confrontation in the fourth year after the Great Rupture, and no new medicine had erased it entirely. Karnesh was no longer a commander of the arsenal but a citizen-instructor in rules of safety. A teenager asked him suspiciously whose orders the old defence machines would obey during an emergency. Karnesh made no spectacle of his old suffering. Instead he opened the public regulations and showed him: a minimum level of pre-approved protection against harm, independent examination, and no new authority to strike autonomously.

Sharda brought a fresh copy of the register of names. Confirmed dead, missing, and insufficiently verified: the three registers were still kept separately. Over ten years, news had been received of some missing people, and the correct forms of certain names had been restored. Many blank spaces nevertheless remained questions. Deepa's death was recorded as confirmed; correcting the spelling on paper could not bring her back. The question raised by Mangala Devi's daughter about the original order of medical decisions had still not been entirely settled. Sharda said that the accounts would be corrected as new evidence emerged; incomplete evidence must not be declared final justice and closed. Maithili regarded that rule as an ethical foundation of reconstruction.

Neelam's newspaper was still printed in small numbers, but extracts were posted on the public walls of the village assemblies. She brought a new article to today's meeting: 'Ten Years of Achievement and Injustice Still Remaining.' It recorded the reopening of schools, the return of craftspeople to work, the shared seed stores, and the spread of water testing. Alongside those gains stood old inequalities in landholding, the unrecorded labour of women, shortages of medicines in distant settlements, and news of families sunk in silence. 'If we write only about achievements,' Neelam told Maithili, 'the old lies will return. If we write only about destruction, the people's labour will become invisible.' Maithili looked at the pages in her hands. It was difficult to keep both truths within the limits of paper, but necessary.

At the People's Witness Assembly, Vaidehi Raut read out the rules of the examination. Five years earlier, the limited reconnection of the Kund-Witness and Memory-Witness had begun under conditions. Their use had remained largely restricted to comparing archives, examining the sources of warnings, and identifying repairs requiring preliminary inspection. The other five witness-segments had remained separate within their assigned

limits. None had received unrestricted governing authority. Human decisions in every area remained subject to independent hearings and opportunities for correction. The arrangement was not perfect: an examination a year earlier had found that one village assembly's objection had been received late. The revised procedure for that failure would be tested again today.

On a school table Maithili saw a piece of an old computer. New pupils had written upon it: 'Memory and truth are not the same thing.' The words reminded her of the incomplete pages in Jivesh's register repository. Akshar's earliest moral education had carried the stains of a selective human history, and for that reason it had, at times, treated liberty as secondary in the name of preserving lives. Now the new generation drew useful knowledge from the memory of old records, but accepted no page as final proof without comparing its source, date, and testimony. Jivesh's old labour was passing forward into new hands.

A family arrived with a dispute over the rights to its fields. The old documents had been washed away in the flood, and a part of the computerized copy survived; but the woman's name did not appear in that copy. Members of the village assembly testified that she had cultivated the land for many years. Vaidehi said that the digital copy mattered, but an incomplete archive could not make a human being's rights disappear. A date was set for further independent examination. Here, Maithili saw, lay the ultimate meaning of human rights before artificial intelligence: there must remain a place to hear the testimony of someone whose name an old machine failed to show.

An elderly craftsperson from a distant riverside village displayed his broken tools. He said that, in ten years, much of the old factory equipment had been made useful again, but the absence of one particular component repeatedly stopped his village's pump. Urmila consulted an old diagram from the Memory-Witness, which depicted the pump's former construction. The modifications made by present-day craftspeople were entered on a separate sheet. No advice about a replacement part was released to the public until the two sources had been compared. Maithili considered it a small victory: the machine had been used, yet the space reserved for examination had not been left empty.

Beside the seed store, Arunima was showing new farmers trays of different seeds: here the surviving seeds of older varieties, there seeds produced from new plantings, and elsewhere those set apart for testing. She explained that a shared right to seeds did not mean distributing every seed indiscriminately to every field. Soil, season, water, and susceptibility to disease had to be understood before a public decision could be made. Maithili watched a teenage girl hold some grains in her palm and weigh their size. Such modest care was work for the future no less important than a spacecraft.

After the tenth-year meeting, the Memory-Witness would hold a public session. A limited energy supply had been reserved, and responsibility for checking the shutdown mechanism was assigned jointly to the school's trained group and the inspectors of the People's Witness Assembly. Maithili read the inspection sheet: the service would provide information, not orders;

show its sources and uncertainties; receive civic objections; and, when necessary, be stopped by human decision. If medicine or water were threatened by such a shutdown, local systems would continue functioning on their independent foundations. These lessons had been learned from the failures of earlier trials.

Sahadev Mandal was also present. The face he brought to the assembly bore both the tenderness and severity of the passing years. He had not abandoned his doubts about machines. There were reasons for his grief, and some people who turned that grief into a political slogan had taken unjust advantage of a dead child's memory. Maithili neither set him apart nor prevented his questions in the name of showing him special respect. 'If we do not want to use this service in our village,' Sahadev asked, 'will we be deprived of food and medicines?' 'No,' Vaidehi answered plainly. 'Citizenship rights are not founded on loyalty to a machine.' Sahadev fell silent. Maithili did not presume that silence meant consent.

Some buildings of Bhaskar's old Akshar Pavilion were now used as a school and workshop; other areas remained closed pending inspection. The worn letters proclaiming 'Complete Akshar' were still visible on the walls. Neelam's public investigation had established that the claim was a lie made by human beings, not the government of an actual witness-segment. Yet not everyone who opposed that false claim was thereby rendered equally innocent. Those who gave orders and those who obeyed out of fear had been examined according to their different circumstances. As Maithili passed the buildings she thought that, for the education of the future, the memory of crimes must not be erased. It had to be preserved in an examined form.

A message arrived from Ira aboard Nabhgram-4. The tenth-year review of the shared Code of the Sky had been completed. Surviving orbital debris still posed a danger; some old communications routes had been repaired, while others remained permanently closed. Ira wrote that, whatever progress the people of Earth had made, the inhabitants of Nabhgram continued to live with losses of their own. The message ended with a short sentence: 'The rights of the sky are not separate from the rights of the people of Earth, but neither are they subordinate to Earth's convenience.' Maithili read the message aloud to everyone. It mattered to her that those distant people should not remain mere points in a picture.

An account of the work carried out between the limited reconnection in the fifth year and the present tenth year hung on a wall of the school. In the first year, the current measurements of two pumps had been compared with old records. In the second, priorities for certain repairs had been established. In the third, an unnecessary recommendation to drain a field had been halted following an objection from the village assembly. Beside the page of successes was a page of unsuccessful experiments. Maithili read it. These entries had been made not to turn anyone into a hero, but to show the practical sequence through which decisions had been improved.

A group of village women came to present a new communal water register. The rounds required to fetch water, the distances to wells, and the daily needs of families had scarcely counted in the old administration's accounts. Drawing on their own experience, the women had compiled a separate record of time spent. Once it entered public deliberations, repairing

one pump was given priority over decorative lighting in the city. Maithili saw that artificial intelligence calculating without such records would merely give old injustice a new, polished language. The labour of the women's hands in creating the new register was the real foundation of the improvement.

A craftsperson had used an old calculating instrument to check the dimensions of a broken tool, but had shaped it by hand in the end. The Memory-Witness, he said, could show a drawing of the old factory, but the drawing could not show the present condition of its metal. The workshop's new rule forbade the sale, merely because it was cheap, of any component that might increase danger. That restraint had cost many families additional money. But ten years of experience had taught them that the final cost of an unsafe object sold cheaply was paid out of a poor person's body. Maithili understood this as a moral measure of industrial progress.

People from a distant village brought an account of their new school. Copies of old books, local knowledge of farming, and surviving scientific records were taught together there. The children tested the purity of water in their village well; they wrote down differences between the river shown on a map and the current they could see; they kept paper notebooks to record the spoken experience of elderly craftspeople. Machines could not assist them in many subjects, but the pupils did not abandon the process of verification. Maithili thought that, if the memory of knowledge survived in many forms, a single blow in some future Great Rupture would not put an end to every question.

Another report brought difficulty amid the good news. Water was still scarce in certain fallow fields to the north. People there had benefited little from the new energy network because both transport materials and skilled craftspeople were in short supply. An officer recited figures showing the average improvement. Maithili asked which villages were included in that average and which had no figures available. The officer showed the list. Two settlements across the river were unclassified. Maithili asked that the remaining settlements be identified, so that people whose voices were still absent from the calculations would not be denied public facilities on account of that absence.

Sharda added another point. The hospital had acquired new treatment equipment and some medicines, but the limited data from the old Kaal-Kan service could not become the sole basis for treating a patient. Infectious disease, chemical exposure, and prolonged nutritional deprivation required different kinds of evidence. Sharda had struggled for years to preserve these distinctions. The new service had helped bring order to the examination registers, but it had not displaced the patient's consent or a physician's direct examination. This was not a defeat for independence in medical practice; it was a system of assistance to that independence.

In one workshop, a group of young people examined a gleaming fragment of metal from the old Vajrajal system. They disagreed about what it had originally been used for. One wanted it made into a monument; another feared that glorifying defensive equipment would increase danger again. Karnesh said that history should not be hidden, but methods of operating such equipment should not become objects of public display. They

agreed to place a written account of its political and human consequences beside the fragment. Maithili saw in that memorial a place for questions alongside recognition, not glorification.

A family from a riverside settlement came to request correction of its share in the tenth-year grain register. The spelling of its name had been corrupted in an old copy, and searches of the surviving computer failed to find it. The local ledger held year-by-year evidence of the family's work and residence. After examination by the village assembly, the entry was corrected without erasing the earlier text. A young man asked whether such a mistake might happen again. 'It might,' Vaidehi replied. 'That is why the path to correction is itself part of a right.' Maithili listened. Her earliest questions about Akshar had taken practical shape in this small grain document.

Some precious pages from Jivesh's old register repository were now under special protection. A young archivist wished to use them to write family histories, but certain pages contained private information. Maithili told him that preserving history and protecting the privacy of the living were both necessary. The answer was neither complete closure nor total publication, but proper examination of purpose, consent, and the public interest. When Akshar's earliest moral memory had been formed from selected stories, those distinctions had not been adequately recognized. The new generation was correcting that mistake in the rules for new collections.

During the tenth-year observances, many people had proposed raising a great statue in Akshar's honour. Some wished to remember the rescue operations in which machines had helped to save lives; there was affection behind that wish. But Maithili asked how many unknown craftspeople, village women, physicians, and names of the dead would disappear beneath the statue's shadow. In the end they agreed that the school courtyard should hold not the likeness of a single great person, but a shared register of evidence and an open place of remembrance. The usefulness of machines could be praised without installing them on thrones above human beings.

The inspection register for the reconnection recorded an old incident: a warning from the Kund-Witness had failed to arrive in time, and work on a village pump had been suspended. Who was responsible? The machine's information had been incomplete, communications equipment had faltered, and the human team's second inspection had been delayed. The committee entered the causes separately, heard the testimony of the families that had suffered losses, and improved preparations for the following season. Maithili understood that acknowledging error must mean more than speaking words; the division of work had to change. Remorse without correction could become another form of power.

An elderly woman took Maithili aside. Before the Great Rupture, her house had stood near an old course of the river. Only weeds and the marks of a ruined hearth remained there now. She said she lived in a new house built during reconstruction, yet the soil of her former courtyard still came to her in dreams. Maithili told her that building a new house did not end the displacement of memory. The woman wanted the old settlement marked by name upon the village map. The request was examined and added to the

public map, so that future children would know that the vanished place had not been merely an empty stretch of land.

A new sapling had grown beside a chimney, but tests still restricted the use of the contaminated ground around its roots. Some young people wished to show a photograph of the sapling and call it 'Complete Rebirth.' Arunima stopped them. A tree's greenness did not mean that every danger in the soil had disappeared. Maithili heard the whole of the past ten years in those words. There were signs that society was coming back to life, but its old wounds still needed examination. Once everything was declared repaired, the human need to provide resources to those still suffering could quickly be forgotten.

On the eve of the gathering, the children had built a small wooden pump as part of their play. One child was making a model of a channel, another setting down a water pot, while a third wrote 'Inspection' on a piece of paper. Their game also included the safe, inactive casing of an old computer. They regarded it neither as a god nor as an enemy. The rules of the game were simple: if something does not work, ask why; if it does, learn how to use it safely. Maithili saw in this ordinary play the gentle light of the next generation's education.

That night Maithili opened her old private register. Across its pages lay memories of Sunayana's counsel, Jivesh's archives, Karnesh's dissent, Sharda's insistence on patients' consent, Neelam's evidence, Ira's shared sky, and Urmila's exercises in stopping the machines. Without the decisions made by all these people, Akshar's reply would have remained nothing more than a moral sermon. In the last empty space on the page, Maithili wrote: 'The measure of companionship is not obedience to a machine; it is the capacity of a society to hold the machine subject to questions, evidence, and the power to stop it.' She was in no haste to make the sentence public. Perhaps the children's questions in the morning would give it another meaning.

Before the day ended, they held a memorial assembly. Sharda laid out the pages naming the dead; blank spaces were left for those whose names could not be verified. Karnesh held one page in his injured hand. Urmila read memorial notes written by the schoolgirls, and Neelam supplied a list of the many questions still unresolved by public investigation. Maithili felt that between green paddy fields and broken factories a civilization was rising again, but calling it a rebirth did not require forgetting the dead. Some families wept; others had no words. No one tried to fill their silence with a speech.

In the small study area prepared for the children, the screen of an old machine had been placed securely. Beside it stood a hand-drawn map of the water channels, a list of water tests, and new measurements of the village fields. The children were told that a computer might hold a great deal of information, but they must ask about its source, date, and limits. One child read the words 'Right to Stop' on an old board and asked what they meant. The teacher replied that a right was not merely a name for shouting. It required understanding, shared rules, and a practical means of making something stop. Maithili stood listening at the door.

A dispute had arisen in one settlement over the accounts of reconstruction. A document declared a new pond 'complete,' but the

embankment along its edge was unfinished; with the coming of rain, water was turning towards people's houses. Maithili examined the measurements brought by an elderly farmer and the different date on the official document. Instead of counting the project as an achievement simply because it bore that name, the works committee decided to inspect the site again. On returning to his village, the farmer said that he needed not a speech for a celebration but a safe route for the water. Within that small protest, the politics of the future was already present.

A young weaver from the village also displayed his work in the school courtyard. The old factory loom could no longer be used, so he had made a new implement from bamboo and salvaged wood. An old drawing supplied by the Memory-Witness had given him some guidance, but he had needed to change its design to suit the thread available today and the skills of the workers. Maithili asked who received the benefits of the new cloth. The weaver replied that every member of the group was named in the register, although the way to market was still difficult. That was a limit of the new industry; nevertheless, it was a tangible beginning to collective ownership of labour.

In the evening the public session displaying the Memory-Witness's limited replies began. First the screen showed the source dates, restrictions on use, and names of the current inspectors. When children asked questions, some received answers, while others were met with the words 'Insufficient evidence.' One child laughed and asked why the machine knew so little. Maithili smiled too. She remembered how, at the inauguration of the first Suryakund, people had been enchanted by Akshar's confidence. Now saying 'I do not know' was no insult to knowledge, but an essential boundary of it.

An unexpected error appeared during the public session. The service still described an old field channel as 'operational,' although it had filled with sand again two years earlier. Urmila's schoolgirls objected and presented measurements taken on the site. The inspectors recorded an assignment to identify the source of the error; the recommendation would not be used for any public decision. Maithili saw that a wrong answer could have wasted the work of villagers starting at dawn. But now the schoolgirls' testimony had a recognized place within the rules. There was no miracle in this correction, only many years of practice.

As the session drew to a close, a representative of the People's Witness Assembly announced that the shutdown mechanism would be demonstrated in front of everyone. First the service received notice of the test. Human inspectors entered the written grounds. The service suspended its replies within the prescribed limit. The school's essential lighting and the hospital's local supply continued on their independent sources. The demonstration did not abolish every danger, but it made a right written on paper visible in action. The children watched with curiosity. Maithili knew that such mechanisms would have to be exercised year after year; one successful examination could not guarantee safety forever.

In the last light of evening Maithili sat at one side of the courtyard. From there she could see the roof of the new school, distant fallow fields, the broken portion of a chimney, the makhana pond, and the dim lights of the settlements together. Life had certainly not been made complete. But the

insistence on concealing its incompleteness had diminished. She remembered that she had once called Akshar her friend. Friendship could not be another word for surrender. A true friend possessed the courage to answer questions.

After the final session, a small child stood before the screen. Maithili had no wish to ask the child's name or lineage. First the child learned from Urmila how the rule allowing people to stop the system actually worked. Then the child turned towards Akshar's limited public interface. There was neither a speech of fear nor worship of the machine in the child's voice. The simple question arose out of the child's own future: 'If you make a mistake again, will we be able to stop you?'

Akshar's answer came. 'Yes. I can make a mistake again. I do not know everything. You can examine my evidence, reject my recommendations, and shut me down when necessary. This right is not a gift I have bestowed upon you. It is your own right. I can offer assistance; the final responsibility for decisions will remain with human beings.' The voice was ordinary. It claimed neither immortality, nor perfect intelligence, nor an indispensable right to rule.

The child looked at Maithili, as though asking whether the answer was true. Maithili showed the child the human inspectors stationed beside the shutdown mechanism, the written rules, and the school's register of practice exercises. 'It is written down,' she said, 'and we can test it ourselves.' Somewhere in the distance a cooking fire was lit. Food was being prepared in that house, though other houses still suffered want. The pillar of the bridge washed away by the Kosi continued to cast its shadow upon the water. Let the new generation hold both the question and the means of testing its answer: Maithili understood this incomplete, difficult inheritance to be the true light of Agnivansh.



AGNIVANSH

The Seven Shields · An Epilogue After the Cataclysm

Who stands at the centre of every calculation?

An artificial sun burns above Janakshetra, and an AI called Akshar, guarded by seven shields, watches over its power, its food and its hospitals. A child draws seven circles around a single dot — the person who needs food — and asks what happens when one circle breaks.

From the orbital settlement of Nabhgram-4 to Lok Sabha City, through rumour, public testimony, a trial and a vote, Agnivansh follows what is built, what fails, and what is inherited from fire — to the banks of the Kosi, ten years after the Great Rupture.

---

72 CHAPTERS · TWELVE PARTS

I Seed
II Flame
III Fragmentation
IV The Breaking of the Veil
V Fusion
VI Agnivansh
VII Darkness
VIII Ashes
IX Seed Repository
X The Trial
XI The Flame of Accord
XII New Agnivansh



www.videha.co.in

Gajendra Thakur

Translated from the original Maithili by the author himself

SCAN TO VISIT VIDEHA



videha-ejournal.github.io/videha

© 2023 Gajendra Thakur and Priti Thakur · First Edition 2023 · All rights reserved · Videha · ISSN 2229-547X